

THE MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

THE CORRELATION OF FEDERALISM AND LIBERALISM IN MASSACHUSETTS,
FROM 1775 TO 1825.

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

by

CHADBOURNE ARNOLD SPRING

19
92
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS,
JUNE, 1935.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter:		Page
I	Introduction	1
II	Brief History of Political Parties in the U. S. 1775 - 1825.	6
III	General Relation of Church and State 1775-1825	22
IV	Relation of Unitarian-Congregational Church and State 1775-1825.	32
V	Political Tenets of Unitarian-Congregational Ministers 1775-1825	40
VI	Political Tenets of Prominent Unitarian- Congregational Laymen 1775-1825	62
VIII	Conclusion	70

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The assertion has been made that all Unitarians were Federalists during the brief existence of the Federalist party, which was roughly from 1795 to 1825. Such an assertion is dangerous, as is any generality, because the chances are that it is not exactly true, as, for instance, we might say that all Catholics are Democrats, which within the ring of our own acquaintances, each one of us can probably prove to be false; but generally speaking, most Catholics are Democrats. So, too, most of the Unitarians of the period mentioned may have been Federalists.

The original assertion is involved in many difficulties, which would further tend to invalidate it, difficulties that can not be dismissed in the sweeping fashion of the statement.

First of all, Unitarianism was not known as such until the year 1815, when the Congregationalist Church split into the two groups now familiar to us as the Unitarians and the Trinitarians. Before that time, all considered themselves Congregationalists, whether liberal or orthodox, hence we are faced with the difficulty of separating the representatives of the two groups during the period prior to the schism when both existed under the same name. Having ascertained who the liberal Congregationalist ministers were, is it safe to assume that the minister's parishioners concurred with him in his political beliefs? On this point there is conflicting evidence.

These are two of the more difficult questions involved

in the assertion which alone would tend to discount it. The intention here is to see how nearly accurate the intended implication of the statement is in relation to the facts gained from documents of the period and the works of men of late years who are fairly reliable authorities.

To overcome the inaccurate use of the word "Unitarianism", the word "Liberalism" is used, so what we wish to find out is the "Correlation of Liberalism and Federalism in Massachusetts from 1775 to 1825". Liberalism, as here used, refers to liberalism in religion, a restriction of the word made necessary by the fact that liberalism in religion and liberalism in any other phase of life do not necessarily go to-gether. In the period under consideration, one is present while the other may be almost completely absent¹.

1. Henry Adams. History of the United States of America during the First Administration of Thomas Jefferson. p.87. "Even Boston, the most cosmopolitan part of New England, showed no tendency in its educated classes to become American in thought or feeling. Many of the ablest Federalists, and among them, George Cabot, Theophilus Parsons, and Fisher Ames, shared few of the narrower theological prejudices of their time, but were converservatives of the English type whose alliance with the clergy betrayed as much policy as religion ..."

G. Adolph Koch, Republican Religion. p.295. "But it must be remembered that, while the Unitarian movement in America is properly thought of as a liberalizing of the older New England religious tradition, paradoxically it was also a triumph of conservatism. It was an upper-class movement for the liberalizing or, perhaps more correctly, the civilizing of life. It had its roots in prosperity, urbanity, and worldliness, and was not identical with either republicanism or genuine free-thinking As has been well said, 'Unitarians were liberal in theology, but conservative in well nigh everything else'".

If it is possible to prove that many of the liberal Congregationalist ministers of the period were Federalists, or conservative in their political beliefs, it seems that that would lead us to believe that the Unitarians and Federalists were very closely allied. And if we can find many prominent laymen who were both Unitarian and Federalist, we shall probably have to admit that probably the assertion made is quite accurate.

The discussion will center around the Federalists in Massachusetts, in particular the eastern section of that state for the strength of the Federal party was to be found in New England of which Boston was the political, social, and even theological center.

This attempt to prove the relationship between the Religious Liberals and the Federalists has been considerably hampered by lack of sufficient evidence. The most desirable procedure would be to find for each political event firsthand evidence of the inclinations of the Congregational-Unitarian ministers of the period; but unfortunately that has proved to be impossible for two reasons. First of all ministers frequently avoided political discussions, or if they entered upon them, they would not express partisan views, though, as will be seen, this was not always true; and second, only a relatively few sermons were published, and of those, many have disappeared.

The sermons that did have any political interest and have been saved refer almost entirely to just three things, the Federal Constitution, the French Revolution, and the War

of 1812, though other sermons may refer to other events, such as one in which a certain passage may be construed as an objection to the Louisiana Purchase. Only one minister, John Lathrop, said in so many words that he was a Federalist; few even used the words Federalist or Federalism; even fewer the words Democratic, or Republican, in capitalized form. So while there is considerable evidence, it is not so wide-spread as to give a continuous story from 1775 to 1825. Of secondary material there is plenty, histories, biographical sketches, and funeral sermons, which has greatly aided in reaching some conclusion. It might be added that the newspapers of the period concerned have been preserved in abundance, but for the purpose of this thesis, they have proved of little or no value because, even more than to-day, the editorials do not bear the name of the writer, but some assumed name as "Philelentheros" or "Juno" or "Brattle-Street", a name used by Governor James Sullivan. Rarely have the owners of these names been discovered, while frequently identification has aroused prolonged discussion and uncertain conclusions. It is as though a hundred years from now one were to attempt to identify "Uncle Dudley" of the Boston Globe. The chances are one might be baffled, unless access could be gained to the paper's intimate records. So what might have proved to be a fine source of evidence, has, in fact, proved utterly unsatisfactory.

Not-with-standing the scarcity of primary source material, sufficient has been made available, which, combined with secondary material, leads to the conclusion, that the implication of the assertion stated at the beginning comes very

close to the truth. Many of the leading Congregational-Unitarian ministers and laymen of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were extremely conservative in their political and social outlook and hence were associated with the Federalist party.

In attempting to prove the correctness of this conclusion it is necessary that there be an understanding of the political history of the time. This will be sketched briefly with reference only to those situations which are mentioned or alluded to in sermons and other sources to be quoted later on. There will then be a brief reference to the relation of Church and State, with particular reference to the Congregationalist denomination, followed by evidence from the sermons of several ministers, whose names, found in Sprague's "Annals of the American Pulpit", are given as those ministers who might class themselves as Unitarian-Congregationalists. Finally there will be included the names of several prominent Unitarian laymen with evidence of their political affiliations.

CHAPTER II

BRIEF HISTORY OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE U.S. - 1775 - 1825

The Revolutionary War resulted in driving the Tories from this country back to England and the victory of the Whig or Patriot Party. Most of the aristocrats remained true to the crown and fled,¹ Henry Cabot Lodge describes quite succinctly what took place just before, during, and immediately following the war:

"In provincial times although the political system and theory of Massachusetts were democratic, there was a powerful aristocracy holding all the appointive and many of the elective offices, and recognized as leaders in public affairs The remnants of the provincial aristocracy however were at best insignificant, and new men had ample openings in the great gaps which the war had made. The new men, of course, came; and equally, of course, they were the leaders of the successful Revolution. They were not, however, as commonly happens in such cases, drawn from the class immediately below that which had been overthrown. The country aristocracy, the squires and gentry of the small towns, had been as a rule on the side of resistance to England, and had furnished most of the Revolutionary leaders - (after the war they moved into Boston) - To this class .. belonged for example the Adamses and Fisher Ames from Norfolk (County), the Prescotts from Middlesex, and the Sullivans from New Hampshire; while from Essex, most prolific of all, came the Parsonses, Pickerings, Lees, Jacksons, Cabots, Lowells, Grays, and Elbridge Gerry."

So Boston became once again the center of aristocracy, only now a more democratic aristocracy, though later they were to be considered anything but democratic.

The migration of the Tories from Boston resulted, among other things, in the almost complete loss of the

¹ Henry Cabot Lodge. Boston. In Historic Towns. Edited by E.A. Freeman and W. Hunt. 1902. p.166 f.

original members of King's Chapel, then Episcopalian,¹ but with the rise of a new aristocracy, there is reason to believe that the pews were not long vacant.

The rise of the new aristocracy, if it was not the cause of, at least accompanied the division of the Whig party into two factions: first, the Particularist Whigs who desired "a government republican in form and democratic in spirit, with rights of local self-government and states rights ever uppermost", and second, the Strong Government Whigs who desired a "government republican in form, with checks upon the impulses or passions of the people, liberty, sternly regulated by law, and that law strengthened and confirmed by central authority - the authority of the national government to be final in appeals".² So we see how futile it is to attempt to identify political parties then and even now with the Whigs and Tories of the Colonies and of England.

When it was discovered that the Articles of Confederation, which had sufficed during the period of war, failed miserably under peace time conditions, and that a new form of government was needed to secure the safety of the Colonies, the idea of the Constitution was born, and virtually with it the two parties known as the Federalist and the Anti-Federalist, the latter being later incorrectly applied to the Democratic - Republican Party.

The Federalists were in favor of the adoption of the

1. King's Chapel Lectures - The Religious History of New England. p. 58.

2. Cooper and Fenton. American Politics. p. 5.

Federal Constitution, while the Anti-Federalists opposed such a move. This party alignment showed even more pronounced class distinction than at any time since the Revolution. The opposition was voiced by inland farmers, debtors, and other less prosperous people who harbored a "deep suspicion of and hatred against the upper classes"¹; while the support of the Constitution came from "merchants, manufacturers, government bond holders, and other people of substantial property interests along the line of the sea-board towns and populous regions"².

John Quincy Adams, a prominent Unitarian and Republican, but originally a Federalist, wrote scathingly in his diary, October 12, 1787:

"He (Theophilus Parsons) favors very much the Federal Constitution -- nor do I wonder at all -- as it is calculated to increase the influence, power, and wealth of those who have any influence. If the Constitution be adopted, it will be a grand point in favor of the aristocratic party. There are to be no titles of nobility, but there will be great distinctions, and those distinctions will soon become hereditary, and we shall consequently have nobles, but no titles --- it is hard to give up a system which I have always taught to cherish, and to confess that a **free** government is inconsistent with human nature." ³

In spite of this and other opposition, the Constitution was adopted, and thus the men of property and those whose outlook was that of the property-owning class began to feel their

1 Anson E. Morse. The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800. p.49.

2 James H. Hopkins. A History of the Political Parties in the United States. p.3.

3 Anson E. Morse. op. cit. p.49

strength and power. The fight for adoption was a bitter one, with many of the Federalists in favor of establishing a monarchy, or at least of perpetuating the aristocracy with the President to be called "Excellency" or "His Highness the President of the United States and Protector of their Liberties!"¹ Jefferson, Samuel Adams and a few others objected even to "Esquire" while Hamilton and John Adams opposed those men; John Adams declaring that "the British Constitution would be most perfect if a few of its defects and abuses were corrected"² for "Mankind would rather be rich under a simple monarchy than poor under a democracy"³, while Hamilton vowed that the British system was perfect and to change it would impair it. This school of men had rebelled not at England government, but the manner of its administration.

The election of Washington as the first President, removed for the time being the dangers of party strife, for he was revered and trusted by all; his patriotism, his integrity, his ability and sagacity were enough to insure harmony and prosperity during the early years of the nation when decisions could not be made based on precedent but conditions necessitated pioneering in the field of government. Unfortunately only temporarily did the condition exist where party differences were practically forgotten. The Whiskey Rebellion in Pennsylvania, the French Revolution with Washington's plea for neutrality, were only two of many points, which led to sharply defined parties. Brander Mathers declares that "the Americans divide

1. James H. Hopkins. op.cit. p.6

2. Ibid. p.5.

3. Charles Merriam. A History of American Political Theories. p. 126.

instinctively into Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians. The Hamiltonian believes in government by the best, by the selected leaders, competent to guide the less competent mass; and this is aristocracy in the best sense of that abused word. The Jeffersonian believes that the average man, however unenlightened, actually knows his own business, or at least knows what he wants, better than any superior person can know it for him; and this is true democracy in the least sense of that abused term. These two attitudes are inevitably antagonistic; they are instinctive, intuitive, innate".¹

However natural it was for the people to divide, they did and thus grew up the Democratic-Republican party of Jefferson which opposed many of the policies of the new Government under the Constitution. The essential differences in the views of these two parties became quite sharply defined when Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury in Washington's Cabinet, introduced a financial policy that would, among other things, establish a National Bank and also have the nation assume the debts of the states, debts contracted chiefly during the Revolutionary War. To this Jefferson and his cohorts set up active opposition, which eventually caused him to give up his Cabinet position of Secretary of State. Generally speaking, the Federalists were decidedly inclined towards any measure which would consolidate the states and increase the power of the federal government, while the Democrats, the name Republican being later dropped, though often used, were opposed to such measures, believing that the states should be all powerful,

1. Charles A. Beard. The American Party Battle. p.2

while the central government was to do little more than regulate the foreign relations of the states.

"Jefferson's theory of government, as far as it was not modified by political expediency seems to have been founded on the desire for exaltation of individual rights. The states were to him mere governmental agencies, less likely to oppress the individual than the more distant, ignorant, and indifferent Federal Government. The Federalists on the contrary, were much disposed to the development of influential classes, such as protected manufacturers and national bankers, not for the sake of classes, but for the purpose of forming a power within the States, and in all the States, which should look to the Federal Government for support and should prevent any break-up of the Union through State supremacy".¹

How political expediency modified Jefferson's program will be seen a little later on, but the quotations above give the two lines of political thought which the clergy, as we shall later see, used in their sermons.²

Suffice it to say at this moment that the change in party policy, which has extended to the extremes just noted, was soon to be seen during Jefferson's administration.

1 Justin Winsor. Narrative and Critical History of America Vol.4 p. 268.

2 Here it is interesting to note that the Democratic-Republican party of that time believed emphatically in individualism while the Democratic party, during the present administration particularly is investing more and more power in the hands of the Federal Government; whereas the Federalist Party stood for a strong central authority while the present Republican party, the successors of the Whigs, which were the successors of the Federalists, believes in "rugged individualism", which with the exception of the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under President Hoover has shown no tendency of encouraging increased centralized power. The Democratic Party policy in the past, as now, is designed to "democratize" the economic life of the country to the benefit of the masses and the disadvantage of the wealthy, but that policy has shifted from individualism to a strong central government.

France's declaration of war on England in 1793 increased the breach between the parties; the "Federalists as the party of law and order and of established government, were shocked at the outrages and excesses of the 'Reign of Terror' in France (the French Revolution having been under way for a considerable time) and they thought it most important to restrain the democratic excesses promoted by the French Revolution", so they favored neutrality while "the Republicans, as the party of liberty and the rights of man, looked with more leniency upon the French excesses as necessary accompaniments of a struggle of a people to be free".¹ The Federalists became known as the English party while the Republicans were the French party.

The bitterness that grew up between the two parties can be shown from several little incidents that make us aware how intensely people felt in the early days of this nation. Washington, the man who was really above party was labeled by the Republicans, "The Stepfather of his Country"², while Nathaniel Ames called the Federalist party the "prigarchy"³. The Federalists in turn punished many Republicans for trivial criticism of the administration, which was not permitted under the Sedition Act, the product of Federalist extreme nationalism, not unlike present Fascistic tendencies in many of our states, and even in the nation at large. One friend of Jefferson was convicted for saying, among other things: "Mr. Adams has only completed the scene of ignominy which Mr. Washington began"⁴.

1 James A. Woodburn. Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States. p. 14-15.

2 James Bryce. The American Commonwealth, vol.II p.7-footnote.

3 Charles Warren. Jacobin and Junto. p70 4 Chas.Beard.opcit p 40

But the crowning example of political rancor was seen when¹ Nathaniel Ames, a decided Republican, in July 1808 refused to attend the funeral of his brother, Fisher Ames, one of the leading Federalists in Massachusetts, because the funeral was to be held publically in Boston, under the charge of a committee composed of leading Federalists.

That this Federalism should find as its stronghold New England is surprising for that section of the country "was, by its system of local self-government through the town meeting, as well as by the absence of slavery, in some respects the most democratic part of the United States"² ... the reason for Federalist strength in New England being found partly in its Puritanism, which revolted at the deism or atheism of the French revolutionists, partly in the interest of its ship owners and merchants, who wanted a central government which could make and carry out treaties with England and so develop American commerce, and which could reform the currency of the country and institute a national banking system. Moreover, the Constitution of Massachusetts restricted suffrage to persons "Having a freehold estate within the commonwealth of an annual income of three pounds, or any estate of the value of sixty pounds"³.

The extent to which the Federalist party existed in

-
- 1 Charles Warren. op.cit. p.11-12
 2 James Bryce. op.cit. p.10.
 3 Henry Adams. History of the United States. p.86

Massachusetts should not be judged by the words of the biographer of James Sullivan, a Republican governor of Massachusetts, 1807-1808, who was called "head of one of the two great parties into which the people of the state, were for many years nearly equally divided"¹, for it was not so much the numbers as the positions occupied by the Federalists that should be considered. In Boston almost without exception the men of wealth, learning, and influence were among their number²; Federalist was the clergy, shocked at the increasing infidelity in France, capitalists,...merchants, and loyalists³. Joseph Story, a prominent Republican of the time, on entering the Massachusetts Legislature in 1805 was practically compelled to become a leader in debate for so few professional men were Republicans⁴, and he admits he was practically the only lawyer in Essex who was either secretly, or openly, republican. He writes to a friend,

"I felt many discouragements from this course ... To young men with my political opinions the times are very discouraging. In Massachusetts at that period, an immense majority of the people were Federalists; all the offices, (with scarcely an exception, I believe) were held by Federalists. The governor, the judges, the legislature were ardent in the same cause. It cannot be disguised, too, that a great preponderance of the wealth, the rank, the talent, the civil and literary character of the state, was in the same scale...."⁵

-
- 1 Thomas C. Amory. Life of James Sullivan. Introduction. p.VI
 - 2 Justin Winsor. Memorial History of Boston. p.13
 - 3 Thomas C. Amory. op.cit. Vol.2. p.123-124.
 - 4 W.W. Story. Life and Letters of Joseph Story. p. 126
 - 5 Ibid p. 95-96.

He even called himself a political heretic among the lawyers of Essex County, the home of that powerful Federalist group, the Essex Junto. This power in office was resented by the Republicans who felt the Federalists no better suited for the posts than themselves, and James Sullivan did his utmost to hold in check any ascendancy of the Federalists in the national councils¹. A writer in a New Hampshire newspaper in 1797 complains that "anything opposed to the ideas of the Administration constitutes Jacobinism" (The Jacobin Clubs were, the Federalists claim, clubs of Republicans founded under French influence, and deistically inclined). "To be true Federalists, we must be at once deaf, dumb, and blind; we must hear nothing, say nothing, see nothing"².

The predominance of the Federalists is also well indicated by a list, printed in 1801, of conspicuous people in Massachusetts³, Federalists and Anti-Federalists (this term means really the Democrats, not the members of an earlier party). Among the Merchants, Doctors, Lawyers, and Political characters, the Federalists far out number the "Anti-Federalists", while of "The Reverend Gentleman" the paper writes, "This much respected body are almost wholly Federal. Some whispers have existed to the disadvantage of the Pastors of Rowley and Mendon, but we believe that they do not merit the disgrace".

When the Federalist party was finally vanquished in 1824 by the new Republican-Democratic forces, the community

1 Thomas C. Amory. op.cit. p.250.

2 Wm. A. Robinson. Jeffersonian Democracy in New England. p. 23

3 Columbian Sentinel. Wed., Jan. 14, 1801.

felt an exhilarating effect. Once the conservative and aristocratic elements lost power, the "forces of liberalism and progressiveness surged up in overwhelming fashion"¹.

The Federalist Party, while in full power, lost no opportunity to show the contempt felt for the Democratic Party. Hamilton at a New York dinner replied to some democratic sentiment by, "Your people, sir - your people is a great beast!"² William Bentley of Salem, a Republican and a Unitarian minister, was called by such names of contumely as "Jacobin", "Democrat", or "Jeffersonian infidel"³, while Joseph Story writes that the Federalists persecuting him relentlessly for his political principles, and finding his life pure beyond reproach accused him of "being a Bonaparte in modesty and ambition"⁴. Democracy was denounced by Wm. Sullivan, a Federalist son of Republican James Sullivan, who writes,

"The informed and the opulent, ask only that their country be saved from the horrors of democracy ... It is not from monarchy, it is not from aristocracy, that dangers threaten, but do they not threaten from democracy? In the affairs of men there is no test but experience, and experience proves, that, wherever free governments have been lost their loss is dated from the innovation of those, who pronounce themselves patriots and friends of the people."⁵

James Sullivan's biographer, however, in judging from that man's works believes that Republicans were as reasonable, just, and patriotic as their opponents⁶ while they, the Republicans, disgusted by conditions hopelessly attempted to fasten the stigma of

1 A.B.Hunt. Editor. Commonwealth History of Massachusetts. vol. III. p.12

2 Henry Adams. op.cit. p.85.

3 Joseph H. Allen. Unitarianism Since the Reformation. p.182-3.

4 W.W.Story. op.cit. p.106

5 Wm.Sullivan. Oration. July 4, 1803. p.12

6 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p.VII

British sentiments upon the Federalist clergy.¹

During all this party strife there stood men to whom the sacrifice of principles for the sake of party was unthinkable, and among these we find Washington, and Joseph Story, who because of opposition to some of Jefferson's policies was called a "pseudo-republican"², and who, in spite of his professed Republican beliefs, entertained the highest admiration of Washington and John Adams³. Noah Worcester, a Unitarian minister, speaking of the similarity of parties says,

"In all instances of war between nations, and dissensions between parties in the same nation or society, both parties appear almost totally blind to their own faults. Each party will censure the same things in the other, of which they themselves are flagrantly guilty, and not appear sensible of the least inconsistency."⁴

A Congregationalist minister deploras the existence of parties, with their minor, unimportant differences, and insists all should join in opposing the War of 1812 when he says, ... "They are all Federalists; they are all Republicans...they ought all to be called the Peace Party"⁵.

This similarity of party interests that was so frequently ignored, the shifting of each party's policies so as in time to assume the position once taken by the other party, all contributed to the eventual vanquishment of the Federalist Party about 1825.

1 Anson E. Morse. op.cit. p.134

2 H.C. Lodge. op.cit. p. 188 : W^m.Bentley. Diary. vol 3. p.348.

3 W.W. Story. Op.cit. p.3.

4 Noah Worcester. Sermon on the Declaration of War. June 28, 1812. p.15.

5 Otis Thompson. Sermon. National Fast. Aug.20,1812

The greatest party difference, the attitude towards the central government, was closely connected with the interpretations put on the Constitution by the two parties. The Federalists were for a construction of that document so as to favor the great central power, in other words they favored a liberal construction of it; while the Republicans wanted that power restricted, hence were for a strict construction. The Federalists being broad and liberal in this respect were called by the Republicans, loose constructionists; and the Republicans being strict, were called by the Federalists, narrow¹. These views were shown in the Federalist Alien and Sedition Laws, which provoked the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions that were prepared by Madison and Jefferson. Hamilton's financial policy disturbed the Jeffersonian theory of strict-constructionism, and caused Madison to break away from the Federalist Party². In his inaugural address Jefferson said he would reduce the army and navy, reduce the taxes, reduce the public debt, and in general vowed he would construe the constitution strictly, but,

"in their indignant zeal to undo a great wrong (that of Federalist loose-constructionism), they (the Republicans) shut their ears and eyes to the doctrine of strict construction, and repealed the law passed by the Federalists, during the last hours of their power (the end of John Adam's administration), which created twenty-four new courts with their full equipment of officers".³

That was only the beginning of the Jeffersonian trend towards a broad construction of the Constitution. "No sooner had the Democratic party acquired the ascendancy in all the branches

1 James A. Woodburn. op.cit. p.17.

2 Ibid p.18.

3 James H. Hopkins. op.cit. p.20.

of the government, than all complaints (against a broad construction) ceased".¹ How clearly this proved true was seen in the purchase of Louisiana, the signal achievement in Jefferson's first administration, which caused the "Republicans to become latitudinarians, while the Federalists borrowed arguments from the strict-constructionist school".² Jefferson could not defend this act under his original theory of the Constitution, so defended it upon the doctrine of "Necessitas non habet lex".³ To put it briefly the Republicans were in power and for the Purchase, while the Federalists were out and against it.

Expediency demanded it perhaps, but Jefferson continued his change of attitude when he acquiesced in the resuscitation of the American Navy, though his gun-boat system was ludicrously inadequate, so as to win the favor of the merchants who disliked the British impressment of American seamen and the blocking of the American ports in the years prior to the War of 1812. "How far Jefferson had advanced beyond his conception of a general government as 'a very simple organization and a very inexpressive one' was indicated by his message of 1808. Would it not be wise, he queried, to appropriate the surplus revenue to the improvement of roads, canals, rivers, education and 'other great foundations of prosperity and union?'"⁴ Also note the change of the attitude of the Federalists as Joseph Story writes in 1808,

"Will you believe it, that after all the clamor which the Federalists have made about (for) the Navy, almost all of

-
- 1 John Lowell. Article on Washington and Jefferson. p.9
 - 2 Cyclopedia of American Government. p. 579
 - 3 James H. Hopkins. op.cit. p.23.
 - 4 Cyclopedia of American Government. p. 579

them vetoed against this measure (to increase the navy)? I am satisfied that they are enemies to any naval establishment now, because it strengthens the arm of government; and I shall not be surprised at an open opposition to all their favorite doctrines in old times. I must declare that they seem bent on the sole purpose of obstructing the Administration, whether right or wrong."¹

President Madison, though vetoing a National Bank Bill in 1815, was anxious for its passage in 1816, which met with the opposition of a few Democrats and nearly all of the Federalists². The bill, finally passed, was justified unblushingly by the Democrats, by arguments borrowed from Alexander Hamilton, thus seeming to prove the truth of Jefferson's saying, "we are all Republicans, we are all Federalists".³

This changing of opinions by parties confused Joseph Story, who sums it all up when after the formation of the Whig and Democratic parties he, voting with the former, wrote, "I seem to myself simply to have stood still in my political belief, while parties have revolved about me; so that although of the same opinions now as ever, I find my name has changed from Democratic to Whig, but I know not how or why".⁴

In this change of opinions seems to have been the beginning of the end of the Federalist party, which was not so much destroyed as absorbed by the Republican party, which had become nationalized by pressure both from without and from within its own organization.⁵ Jefferson had been politically clever in doing this. The end of the Federalist party was attributable to several facts: the opposition to the War of 1812,

1 W.W.Story. op.cit. p. 190-191

2 Cooper and Fenton. op.cit. p.21

3 Cyclopedia of American Government p. 580

4 W.W.Story op.cit. p.540

5 Cyclopedia of American Government p. 725

almost to the point of open hostility in New England, which could not be forgotten¹; the tactical errors of Federalist leaders; the strength of the democratic impulse of the War of Independence among the citizens who had grown to manhood between 1780 and 1800; but mostly the end was due to Jefferson's ability to organize the hitherto undisciplined ranks of Republican voters². Thus the aristocracy, the wealthy, intelligent merchantile and manufacturing classes were vanquished by the agricultural masses.

Much has been omitted both of the history of the nation, and of the history of the state, but sufficient, it seems, has been given to give a general political picture of the half century concerned and to enable one to gather the political tendencies of the ministers who rarely outspokenly sided with one party or the other.

1 Cooper and Fenton. Op.cit. p. 20
2 James Boyce. op.cit. p.10

CHAPTER III

GENERAL RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE - 1775 - 1825

The relation of church and state has been hinted at in two or three places, but before going into the direct evidence which leads to my conclusion that most of the Unitarian-Congregationalist ministers of the time were Federalists, let us see what light may be thrown on the conclusion by a survey of the relation of the state and church in general from 1775 to 1825.

The clergy in New England had always been deeply concerned in politics. "Tradition favored the priest and the prophet in a political rôle; that rôle the clergy were trying to maintain".¹ From the earliest days of this country the Congregational Church was one of the fundamental institutions. Social and political life centered in the church and the minister was a leader in public affairs, even being regarded as an officer of the town and parish. This uniformity of religious belief until almost the end of the 18th century was one of the causes of New England's peculiar solidarity.²

The clergy long before 1776, and especially the Congregational clergy, stirred and kept alive a spirit of active resistance to the acts of Great Britain, and taught the conceptions of a fixed constitution and of the organization of a free government which were later to lead to the demand for a constitutional convention and a written constitution³, though

1 Jacob C. Meyer. Church and State in Massachusetts-1740-1833 p.133

2 Wm. A. Robinson. op.cit. p. 128 3 Alice M. Baldwin. The New England Clergy and the American Revolution. pl20-1,131

some of the New England clergy did not approve such a radical procedure.¹ The Loyalists were not alarmed since they failed to reckon on the power of the clergy, the close tie between church and state, and the use of the pulpit for the discussion of politics, along with religion and morality.² After war finally was declared it was customary for a clergyman to give the address when the militia mustered or recruiting was to be done.³ By the beginning of the 18th Century the New England ministers enjoyed a local authority somewhat like that of the bishops in Western Europe in the 6th Century, or of the Presbyterian ministers of Scotland in the 17th.⁴ The political sermon, especially those delivered on Fast and Thanksgiving days, was a "powerful weapon in the hands of the clergy and was characterized by almost uniform pessimism and narrowness of view"⁵. At the annual inauguration ceremonies of the Governor and deputies a minister usually preached an election sermon which has been described as having,

"a little of governor, a little of council, a little of congress, much of puffing, much of politics and a little of religion - a strange compost, like a carrot pye, having so little of the ingredients of the vegetable, that the cook must christen it."⁶

The union of politics and religion was recognized in the Constitution which took the right of electing the ministers away from the church members, as such, and gave it to the voters in

-
- 1 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p. 131
 - 2 Anson E. Morse. op.cit. p. 12
 - 3 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p. 125
 - 4 James Bryce. op.cit. p. 709
 - 5 Wm. A. Robinson. op.cit. p. 131
 - 6 ibid p. 131

the town and parishes, and thus subjected the ministers to the will of the people, at least for their election. In 1786 and 1794 other laws emphasized this relationship.¹ The disestablishment of the church and state was not completed until 1833, though in June 1811, a law was passed exempting from ministerial taxation all persons producing a certificate of membership in any other religious society, incorporate or otherwise, a law that was passed after a short period of Federalist control in Massachusetts (1808-1810).

There seemed to be little doubt but that the Clergy, having favored the American Revolution, having sided with the Government during the Shay's Rebellion, 1786-1787 (a democratic movement in western Massachusetts), and having favored the adoption of the Federal Constitution would, when parties arose, adopt the views of the Federalist party, an attitude fostered by Republican sympathies with the French Revolution, which connoted for the New England Clergy deism or worse. Jefferson's liberality in religious views and his fondness for French literature and philosophy made him an object of the suspicion of the Federalists.² Of the very few Congregational Clergy who were Republicans, there were only Allen of Pittsfield, Bentley of Salem (a Unitarian-Congregationalist) and Bradford of Rowley, the latter having delivered a violent tirade against Washington's administration in 1795 and as a result having been ostracized by his fellow clergymen.³

1 Jacob C. Meyer. op.cit. p. 134

2 Wm. A. Robinson. op.cit. p. 131

3 Ibid p. 132

Only naturally were the Republicans aroused by the domineering tone of the Congregational Clergy and so they became champions of religious freedom and the enemies of clerical privilege; a stand which brought them into rapport with the minor dissenting religious bodies in New England.

The Jeffersonians, however, while at first trying to keep religion out of politics, "when they found the religious issues playing into their hands, used the weapons which the Federalists had forged for them".¹ By 1800 both political parties were involved in the religious struggle in Massachusetts. To be a truly religious man was, unlike today, of serious importance then, for one lost caste and was shunned by all, were he suspected of infidelity or even deism. "The studied attempts of the Federalists to fasten upon the Republicans the odium of atheism and opposers of religion, which was materially aided by the latter's fierce attack on the clergy, shows the very great force of such an accusation".²

Even as late as 1811, when the Democrats were in possession of the national government, and as the two years before when they controlled the Massachusetts government, the Congregational clergy were almost entirely Federalists.³ The same authority states that in 1812 nine-tenths of the ministers were strong and outspoken Federalists.⁴ The position of the Federalist Clergyman is effectively, if humourously, illustrated

1 Jacob C. Meyer. op.cit. p. 143-144

2 Anson E. Morse. op.cit. p. 116

3 W. DeLoss Love, Jr. The Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England. p. 384

4 Ibid p. 389

by a letter written to a Federalist paper, in which the writer included a new **Scale of Being**:¹

- (1) GOD
- (2) An Angel
- (3) A steady, uniform patriot, like Washington
- (4) A Philanthropist, like Howard
- (5) A Federal Clergyman
- (6) A uniform Statesman
- (7) A timesaving, accommodating Politician
- (8) A hypocrite in Politics, Religion, or Friendship
- (9) A modern hero, like Bonaparte or Suivarow
- (10) A Jacobin or Democrat
- (11) A "Modern Philosopher", like Mezzel
- (12) The DEVIL.

The importance of the clergyman in Federalist activities seems hardly to be doubted, though the exact extent to which parishoners followed their pastor, of whatever party, is confused by conflicting evidence. One report is that "churchgoers divide on political lines, and men accepted only the preaching of those clergymen whose political belief coincided with their own".² John Pierce, a Unitarian minister in Brookline for fifty years, 1797-1847, said in 1847, "I was justly suspected of voting differently from two-thirds at least of my parishoners";³ then again, "many diametrically opposed to him (Bentley) politically, continued under his ministrations", so great was their attachment to him.⁴ So we can not confidently decide whether the people agreed with their Pastor in political life or not. To-day we might be justified in saying there was no reason for believing the two voted for the same party, but in the days in question, the close union of church and state might well justify

1 Columbian Centinel. Sat., August 2, 1800

2 Charles Warren. op.cit. p. 3

3 John Pierce. Sermon. March 15, 1847.

4 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Vol.1 Biog. Sketch by Judge Joseph G. Waters. Nov. 8, 1868. pXIII

the conclusion that the majority of the parishoners followed their Pastor in political affairs.

The extent to which the church was involved in politics was a source of regret to Bentley who wrote in his diary,

"The death of Governor Sullivan might well be deplored as a loss to the ministers of the Congregational Churches, as he was the tye between them and the State, whenever in any of their incorporations the laws required laymen to be united in the exercise of their privileges. But as soon as party opposed Sullivan, they dismissed him from his engagements as if he had been an offender, to answer the vices of a party and to the eternal disgrace of all who had any influence in such irreligious proceedings. Much indeed may be allowed for the outrages of party, but much still must be reckoned to duplicity, subserviency, and policy of some influential ministers, not to name the individuals who disgraced themselves in these transactions." ¹

It was Bentley who endeavored to keep politics and religion apart, believing as he did that the clergy should steer clear of political issues, ² yet apparently he could not resist for it is claimed he often discussed from the pulpit some of the most exciting political problems of the day. ³ The capacity, however, to forgo politics while in church was demonstrated when among the parishoners of the Brattle Street Church were such rival competetors as Bowdoin and Hancock, Federalists of different degrees, Sullivan and Strong, erstwhile Republican and Federalist Governors respectively of Massachusetts, and Lace and Junius, bitter antagonists in print who worked together in harmony to promote the secular prosperity of the parish. ⁴ On the Sunday after Sullivan's funeral, Joseph S. Buckminster, a

1 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Vol.3. p.401. Dec.11, 1808.

2 Jacob Meyer. op.cit. p. 141.

3 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Vol.1. Biog. Sketch of W.B. by Judge Waters. p. XIII

4 Thomas Amory. op.cit. P. 339-340.

Unitarian-Congregationalist minister of Brattle Street Church and apparently a Federalist, studiously refrained from politics with such tactful statements as "The tomb has closed upon his excellences and his imperfections... I only pay the debt of private friendship and public expectation"¹; and "whatever opinions may have been entertained of his public character, by those, who differed in important maxims of political conduct, the salutary effect of many of his labors will, I think, hardly be disputed"². That such separation of religion and politics was not always to exist will become apparent when we search for the evidence of political opinions in the sermons of the Unitarian-Congregationalists of the period.

As has been previously indicated, the Clergy, in particular the Congregationalists, were extremely active before the Revolution in denouncing the injustices suffered by the Colonists at the hands of the English; in fact, so great was the activity, that their opponents gave them the credit of being responsible for the conflict.³ Most of these gentlemen were on the American side during the Revolution because either they depended on most of the people in the town for their salary, or they feared an English victory might harm their own power, or they were convinced of the justice of the cause.⁴ The exact number of Loyalist ministers is hard to determine for they had difficulty in being heard, but there were many, even among the Congregationalists, not necessarily the so-called Unitarian ones, some of

1 Joseph S. Buckminster. Sermon. 1809. p.25
 2 ibid p. 34
 3 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p. 88-89
 4 ibid p. 105

whom were forced to resign, some whose churches were closed, one whose house was stormed by the people with shots being fired. ¹

The zeal of the Clergy for political arguments had not abated by the time of the War of 1812, which Jediah Morse, an orthodox Congregationalist, declared to be unjustifiable and unnecessary, a view in accord with that of the larger proportion of Congregationalist Clergy of New England, ² a zeal that in Salem nearly resulted in the extirpation of the Congregational Churches at the hands of the other sects. ³ The minister of the First Church in Dracutt, Solomon Aiken, whose orthodoxy seems not to have been questioned, assailed the British spirit in America, a spirit opposed, he said, to America's prosperity, a spirit that was Federalism, a new name for old Toryism, "the old serpent in a new skin". He also flays Nathaniel Thayer, and William Clay Channing, two Unitarian ministers, who believed that Congress ordered the attack upon the Indians without reason, thus, in Mr. Aikin's eyes, tending to "exculpate the British, and imputing iniquity to their country's own rulers". ⁴ How easily political enmity could enlarge the slightest hint of disloyalty, when fairness to mankind as a whole provoked such accusations as were made by Thayer and Channing.

The American clergymen at first favored the French Revolution, for the revolution was as much religious as political,

-
- 1 Lorenzo Sabine. Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of American Revolution. Vol.2. Pgs. 7, 150, 232. 311 and 425
 - 2 Wm. B. Sprague. The Life of Jedidiah Morse. p.243
 - 3 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Vol.4. p. 114-115.
 - 4 Solomon Aiken. Address to Federal Clergymen on the Subject of the War Proclaimed by the Congress of the United States against Great Britain, June 18, 1812. - Feb. 23, 1813. p.16,22,80.

and the Americans expected that their late allies would be able to enjoy the same system of liberty as was enjoyed here. But when the uglier aspects of the French Revolution became known, a feverish condition of public sentiment grew up with two sides forming and the clergy, "instead of preaching the gospel of peace and goodwill among men, by their party harangues fanned into flames the element of discord".¹ In this religious-political turmoil in America, no one suffered more from the tongues of the New England Congregational Clergy than Thomas Jefferson, who was denounced as an atheist and a freethinker, who had established religious freedom in his own state.² The religious freedom objected to was, it seems, not so much freedom of theological views as freedom from the domination of the state. This separation of church and state was not favored by the New England Congregationalists who were very powerful in the states' and towns' administrations. It is my impression that political animosity determined the views of Jefferson's religion as held by the New Englanders, for liberal was not the adjective applied to his religious views by the narrow-minded Puritans.³ Jefferson hated the power of the aristocracy and the clergy, a hate commencing when he succeeded Doctor Franklin in Paris in 1784. It was in Paris that, swept along by the philosophical torrent of the eighteenth century, this naturally adventurous intelligence became audacious to a degree bordering on madness.⁴ Knowing of this hatred for them, it would be natural for the New England

1 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p. 297

2 A. B. Hart. Editor of the "Commonwealth Freedom of Massachusetts". Vol. 3. p. 428

3 Anson E. Morse. op.cit. p. 121

4 Adolf Koch. Republican Religion. p. 53.

Clergy to denounce his religious views, when it was his social views that they really opposed.

Having noticed how the clergy in general acted during these tumultuous times, let us more in detail notice the manners, the power, the attitudes of the Congregational Clergy; in particular, those of the liberal school, so that my conclusion as stated at the beginning may be substantiated.

CHAPTER IV

RELATION OF UNITARIAN-CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AND STATE -1775-1825

It has been shown earlier that the Federalist Party of Massachusetts had among its members most of the cultural, the wealthy, and the politically and commercially powerful people of the time, in addition to most of the clergy. When we come to view the general characteristics and importance of the Congregationalist-Unitarians ¹, or the Unitarians, as they were often called for short even before the split in the Congregationalist Church in 1815, we note a correlation between the members of that sect and the Federalists. In mathematics if A equals B and C equals B, then A equals C, so now we note that the Unitarians are the aristocrats, hence the Federalists are the Unitarians. While this last statement is not mathematically precise for some Federalists belonged to other sects, and some Unitarians were Republicans, yet the statement is probably not very far amiss.

Lyman Beecher in 1823 said, while in Boston, "All the literary men of Massachusetts were Unitarians; all the trustees,

¹ The only estimation found of the proportion of Unitatians comes from the sermon of Parsons Cooke, April 3, 1828: p. 4.

"If the proportion of voters can be inferred from the numbers of churches in the different sects, not more than one-fourth are found in this sect (Unitarian)"

and professors of Harvard College; the judges on the bench were Unitarian".¹ The Unitarians were strong among the educated and wealthy class ² - in the words of Theodore Parker "They were aristocrats and exclusive in their tastes, not democrats and inclusive"³, with their roots in prosperity, urbanity, and worldliness, quite different from republicanism or genuine free-thinking.⁴ Brattle Street Church reminded one of a church on Park Avenue, New York, where a display of dress indicated superiority, not necessarily, and probably not, in religious belief, but in the world at large.⁵

The charge of Beecher's that Harvard was Unitarian was refuted by Channing⁶, though Nathaniel Ames declared it to be the "hotbed of Unitarianism".⁷ Be that as it may, the extent of the influence of Unitarianism, the connection between the clergy of the Congregational Churches with the bar and magistracy created a unique union, an organized social system capable of exerting great power ⁸. This power was acknowledged by Dr. Palfrey, one of the founders of the Unitarian Association who remarked to Dr. Edward Everett Hale of the period 1810 to 1830: "We governed Boston and we governed Massachusetts; and they let us do it because we did it so well" but that power did

1 A. B. Hart. Editor. Commonwealth History of Massachusetts. Vol. 4 p. 265

2 Henry Adams. op.cit. p. 90

3 Jacob Meyer. op.cit. p. 207 (footnote)

4 G. Adolf Koch. op.cit. p. 295

5 In 1795 a New York visitor to Brattle Street Church noted "The broad aisle was lined by gentlemen in wigs, with cocked hats and scarlet coats". Justin Winson. Editor. Memorial History of Boston. Vol. 4. p.2.

6 W. E. Channing. Letter to Rev. Samuel C. Thacher. June 20, 1815

7 Charles Warren. op.cit. p. 23.

8 Henry Adams. op.cit. p. 76

not continue "because the aristocracy of Massachusetts tried to preach the gospel to the people of America; but for lack of a miracle of Pentacost, they could not speak the language".¹ There seems little doubt that for a long time "the Congregational polity had its own way in this country, supporting its clergy by a tax, enforcing its decisions by a public sentiment as tyrannous as any civil authority, a union of Church and State quite as effective as had ever been witnessed, so that really when Congregationalism was most successful, it never was Congregationalism other than in name".²

John White Chadwick in a sermon, "Unitarianism, a Democratic System of Religion," preached in 1889, asserted he would leave that sect if there were not many democratic possibilities in it, but he questioned how Unitarianism went with the third term of Lincoln's formula - "for the people". He goes on, "That it is not, has often been contended by its opponents; often, too, it has been conceded by its friends...It originated in an intellectual, cultivated, and aristocratic circle...With political democracy, it had had little sympathy at any time. The last Federalists of New England and the earliest Whigs were to be found in Unitarian Churches".³ This fear of Chadwick's, that Unitarianism was not for the people as a whole, particularly at its inception in this country, was probably well founded, but its sting is mitigated by Alexander Young, a Boston Unitarian minister, who in 1830 wrote

1 Albert C. Dunning. Congregationalists in America. p. 317

2 Rev. James deNormandie. The National Works of the Unitarian Church in America 1880. p. 11

3 John White Chadwick. Sermon 1889. p. 2. Unitarianism a Democratic System of Religion.

a pamphlet, in which he says that Unitarian Christianity has been declared to be for the select few, "the intelligent, the opulent, and the refined"; while being unsuited for the masses, particularly the poor and ignorant; but he gives a plausible reason for it saying,

"Here it (Unitarianism) was first embraced and maintained by the intelligent, reflecting, educated part of the people. It was natural that they should be the first to recognize the truth. -- From the first planting of our land, we were blessed with a race of learned and educated men, both in church and state. Our magistrates and our ministers were accomplished scholars, and profound thinkers ----This ascendancy which Liberal Christianity acquired among persons of judgment and reflection, it has ever since retained, and still possesses." ¹

There appears little doubt as to the part that the Congregationalists and Unitarians played in the years when Federalism was at its height. Well may one in looking at the period concerned agree with the statement of a later minister that the Unitarian Church, more nearly than any other, answers to the description of what a National Church should be; namely one that

"never assumes authority, nor controls legislation, nor levies taxes, nor claims privileges, nor attempts to put a creed into the Constitution; but the Church which stands close to the national life, trains its members to public duty and patriotic service---" ²

True it is, that the Unitarians lived up to that, ostensibly at least; but there is no denying the power the Unitarians held and used in daily life³ though, as a denomination, Unitarianism

1 Alexander Young. Evangelical Unitarianism Adopted to the Poor and Unlearned. 1830. p.3-6.

2 George Batchelor. Essay: The Unitarian Church in Chicago. p.70

3 Parsons Cooke. Sermon. Unitarianism an Exclusive System, or the Bondage of the Churches That Were Planted by the Puritans. Annual Fast. April 3, 1828.

p. 2-3- "The chief offices of trust and profit have been for a long time monopolized by one denomination of religionists (Unitarian)" p.5 "I could point to you towns where not one in twenty of the citizens belong to the liberal class, but which for many years in succession have been represented by such people"

never interfered with **civic** affairs. The tendency of Congregationalists and Unitarians to use legislation to their own ends produced bitter feelings on occasions. One writer, "Philelentheros" objects to the section of the Bill of Rights that says any citizen not uniting with some particular religious society shall be considered a congregationalist, a step the writer considers just short of religious tyranny and a national religion. The enemies of religious freedom, he says, are those who falsely call themselves Federalists ¹.

Another evidence of the use made by the Unitarians of their power comes from the reply made by Rev. Parsons Cooke of the East Church, Ware, Massachusetts, to a letter in the Christian Examiner written by "One of the Honorable Magistrates of Our Commonwealth", who violently objected to Cooke's Fast Day Sermon of April 3, 1828, entitled "Unitarianism an Exclusive System". Cooke unmercifully condemns the Unitarians saying he realizes the danger of questioning the "infallibility of the Unitarian Aristocracy" and asking "by what process have these men and their doings become so identified with the State, that the State must stand or fall with them" and "how is it, that to prove these men unfaithful to the State becomes seditious and equivalent to overturning our institutions?" ² Particularly is Cooke upset because Andover Theological Seminary had great difficulty in getting the power of its trustees increased while the legislature passed an act giving Harvard not less than one hundred thousand dollars!

¹ "Philelentheros" - Pamphlet: "A blow at the root of Aristocracy or An appeal to matters of **Fact** in Support of Religious Freedom". written after 1810. p. 19

² Christian Examiner. 1829. p.6.

That act, he says, could not be passed (in 1814) "unless Unitarians, Universalists, and other errorists of every description may receive the benefit of the funds, as well as those for whom they were given and intended".¹ Cooke goes further and says that the petition for the Charter for Amherst College was finally passed by the Unitarians because they had finally "devised a means whereby the legislature would eventually gain possession of the college through the exclusive right to fill the first five vacancies on the Board of Trustees".

Besides denouncing this meddling of Unitarians in state legislation Cooke says that most of the Unitarians of the time (1815) were Federalists and that in reality Federalism was Unitarianism². This was perhaps an extreme and unjust criticism of the Unitarians, but in view of the general consensus of authorities, an element of truth seems to be there. That there was a close connection between the Federalists and the Liberals (or the Congregationalists of the more liberal type before the name Unitarian was generally adopted) seems certain, for back in 1795 we find most of the Congregational ministers taking the opportunity of Thanksgiving to denounce Jeffersonianism and laud Federalism, notable exceptions being Bradford of Rowley, Massachusetts, who was hence called by his colleagues the "Vandal of Rowley", Bentley of Salem, and Allen of Pittsfield.³ This coalition of the Congregationalists and Federalists assured the latter of their political power, but once the coalition weakened that power weakened. The Republican party aimed to get on its

1 Parsons Cooke. Reply to the Christian Examiner, 1828 -p. 13-14

2 *ibid* p. 24

3 Jacob Meyer. *op.cit.* p. 141.

side the minor sects, and it was strengthened by the Unitarian-Trinitarian split in 1815.¹

The mention of the split makes us wonder just what was the extent of the liberal Congregationalists, before the year 1815 when Unitarianism was really openly acknowledged in this country. One estimate is that in 1814 of the two hundred and seventy-five Congregational Churches seventy-five at once came to be regarded as Unitarian.² Another opinion is that as early as 1800 there was not a strict Trinitarian clergyman of the Congregational order in Boston³. Andrew Peabody was of the opinion that in 1780 nearly all of those Boston pulpits were filled by Unitarians, while the age of Unitarianism was testified to by John Quincy Adams who in a letter of 1815 mentioned several ministers of sixty-five years before who were Unitarians.⁴ So we can come to the conclusion that Liberalism existed in fact, if not in name, over a half century before the year 1815, and that the clergymen of that belief were sufficient in number to have been of considerable influence politically, at least, during the periods from 1775-1825.⁵

In 1823 the Federalists lost control in Massachusetts. The Republicans passed a law favoring the disestablishment of the Congregation, a law that culminated years of effort, and a law favored by the Trinitarians, while the Unitarians opposed it, thus offering further indication of the Federalist-Unitarian mutual sympathies.⁶ The Unitarians were the last denomination

¹ Jacob Meyer. op.cit. p. 141

² Albert E. Dunning. op.cit. p. 300.

³ Joseph Henry Allen. Unitarianism Since the Reformation. p. 181

⁴ Albert B. Hart. op.cit. p. 256

⁵ Wm. B. Sprague. Life of Jedidiah Morse. p. 46-47.

⁶ Jacob Meyer. op.cit. p. 220.

in the Commonwealth to be converted to the voluntary system of free support of the church.

Thus far the evidence points quite certainly toward the conclusion that most of the Unitarians were Federalists. It is quite impossible to prove this to be absolutely true since it would be necessary to know the political and religious convictions of every Congregationalist over the span of the fifty years under consideration. It would be reasonably safe to draw conclusions from the evidence already given, but it is safer to give direct evidence of many of the leading clergymen and laymen.

As has been previously mentioned, the following evidence does not give a consecutive picture of the political beliefs held by the clergy. Though it is quite fragmentary it seems sufficient for the present purpose. First we shall consider the clergy with Federalist leanings, then those with Republican leanings - rather than one, for William Bentley is the only Unitarian clergyman who has been found to have Republican political beliefs. Finally we shall consider a few laymen who have written or spoken of their religious convictions, or who from less direct evidence we find belonging to the Unitarian Church and one of the two political parties of the time.

Mr. Sprague in his list of Unitarian-Congregational ministers mentions several for whom no evidence of political inclinations was found; those for whom it was possible to find such evidence will be mentioned in the same chronological sequence that he follows.

CHAPTER V

POLITICAL TENETS OF UNITARIAN-CONGREGATIONAL MINISTERS 1775-1825

Ebenezer Gay, of Hingham, ended his seventy years ministry in 1787 and hence was unable to participate in the Federalist-Republican political battle; but he lived during a period when the political parties were the Whig and the Tory, to the latter of which he adhered in the Revolutionary period.¹ In the pulpit he was one of the few who succeeded in avoiding politics entirely and yet held the affection of their people. His silence the press believed to be an indication of indifferent patriotism, for which he was severely attacked.² Since Gay was a Tory (the aristocratic party before the Tories left America) and since the Federalist party seems to have been the aristocratic one after the Whig party split up, it is not at all unlikely that Gay favored the Constitution with a strong Federal government and would have sided with the Federalist party, as long as he must chose between being a Federalist or an Anti-Federalist.

Dr. Charles Chauncey, of Boston, died the same year that Gay did, but unlike Gay he was probably a Whig for from 1750 to 1776 he was an ardent champion of the principle in Rev. John Wise's masterly plea - "Democracy, Christ's Government in Church and State". He knew the colonies were right and would triumph.³ As an old and fiery man, he led the Boston ministers in refusing to read any proclamations of the Governor and Council, and when General Gage refused to appoint a day of fasting and prayer

1 Samuel A. Eliot. Heralds of a Liberal Faith. Vol. 1. p. 4

2 Alice M. Baldwin. op. cit. p. 131-2 & footnote. 3 Justin Winsor. op. cit. VIII. p. 122-23

because "the request was only to give an opportunity for sedition to flow from the pulpits", these ministers went ahead and proposed that July 14th be so observed.¹ Chauncey was always attached to his country, whose peace and prosperity were his greatest objectives.²

Dr. Daniel Shute, of Hingham's Third Parish, was a zealous Whig³, who was a delegate at the meeting for forming the state's constitution, and later at the convention for adopting the Constitution of the United States.⁴ Beyond this nothing was uncovered to aid in more exactly determining his later political affiliations.

Of Dr. Thomas Barnard, of Salem, we learn from his sermon of February 19, 1795, of his Federalist leanings, for he believes that our hearts should be affected first of all by "the Federal Constitution of Government, both with respect to the excellence of its form, and the kindness of its operation".⁵ Later he denounces the insurrection in western Pennsylvania (the Whiskey Rebellion)⁶ led by ambitious men who would have profligated the laws and ruined the Union, that they might affect their local interests, thus upsetting the nice functioning of the Government.

Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, of the West Church, Boston, died in 1766, hence really doesn't come within the scope of this work, yet it might be mentioned that in 1750 he gave a discourse in

1 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p.123

2 Rev. John Clark. Sermon on Charles Chauncey. Feb.15,1787. p. 26

3 Samuel A. Eliot. op.cit. Vol.I p. 4

4 Rev. Henry Wise. Funeral Sermon of Rev. Daniel Shute. Sept.1. 1882. p. 19

5 Dr. Thomas Barnard. National Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb.19,1795. p.11

6 Cooper & Fenton. op.cit. p.8. "The Whiskey Rebellion was simply the chance looked for by the opposition to the Federalist policies to rally about an issue."

which he argued against submission to royal power when arbitrarily exerted, and that in 1766 he urged upon James Otis the desirability of a closer union of the colonies as "perhaps the only means of perpetuating their liberties".¹ From such sentiments it is not hard to imagine that he was a Whig, and possibly had he lived, might have been a Federalist, which, however, is pure conjecture.

Rev. David Barnes, of Scituate, in a sermon on George Washington dwells at great length on the wisdom of our neutrality in French affairs, a neutrality bitterly opposed by the Republicans, as he says, "By observing the line of neutrality, we have suffered, but nothing, it is probable, to what we should have done, if we had been weak enough to have engaged in war".² This was a view the Federalists in general held: however unpleasant neutrality was, it was far less unpleasant than war. To have fought with the French against the English would have been an indication of approval of the deistic and atheistic tendencies of the French. To overlook the abuses to us by the English and to try to patch up the troubles diplomatically was preferred, hence Jay's Treaty, which disappointed all, but aroused the Republicans' anger on learning of the Federalists' support of it.³

Of the Samuel Wests there are presented opposite pictures. He, of Needham and Boston, was a well wisher of his country's liberties during the Revolution, yet he kept his political sentiments so hidden that he is said to have died without a political

1 Luther A. Weigle. The Pageant of America. Vol.X p. 120

2 Rev. David Barnes. Sermon on George Washington. Feb.22, 1800 p. 118

3 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p. 300

enemy.¹ On the other hand he of New Bedford was a zealous Whig, who, detesting luke-warmness, blazed out against the mother country, joined the American Army, and later influenced Governor Hancock to assent to the adoption of the Federal Constitution.² Whether or not this gentleman of New Bedford was a Federalist must be determined from the above facts, and since an Anti-Federalist was one who opposed the adoption of the Constitution, we would be apt to conclude that the Samuel West of that town was a Federalist.

When we come to Henry Cummings of Billerica we find a more definite political statement. One of the first to assert the rights of this country³, he believed that the states should endeavor "to strengthen those bonds of union which have connected all to gether, as one independent nation", and that the good of individual states should be considered only when it enhanced the good of all the confederacy.⁴ Thirteen years later, while believing only time would prove the worth of the Jay Treaty, we find him denouncing the presence of a party in this country that has tried to "precipitate us into a war with Great Britain"⁵. At the same time Cummings speaks of the "excellencies of the Federal Government, which combines them (the states) in one grand republic".⁶ What more Federalist assertions could we ask for?

Simeon Howard, of Boston, we know little of politically

1 W.B.Sprague. Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit. p.55

2 John Eliot. A Biographical Dictionary. p.48, W.B.Sprague. op. cit. p. 39-40 3 Wilkes Allen. Sermon on Henry Cummings. Sept. 8, 1823. p. 15

4 Henry Cummings. Election Sermon. May 28, 1783. p.36

5 Henry Cummings. Sermon of Public Fast & Thanksgiving. Dec. 15, 1796. p. 21,22.

6 ibid p. 26.

except that he was a decided Whig¹, and very happy about the prospect of a new constitution of government², so we hesitate to say whether he was a Federalist or not.

When we come to John Lathrop, of Boston, we find a Unitarian minister who has repeatedly expressed Federalist views and who was, as was mentioned earlier, outspoken in this respect, even to the extent of praising the Federalist party, using the word Federalist, something few, if any, others cared to do. "A uniform and ardent Federalist" from the time of the formation of the Constitution³, a great disciple of Washington, "during the War of 1812, he was, like most of his brethren, convinced our government was greatly in fault".⁴ As early as 1770, he was heard in public affairs for, aroused by the Boston Massacre, he chose for his sermon text "The voice of thy brother's blood cryeth unto me from the ground";⁵ thus began his zealous and untiring industry that showed itself so forcefully on the Patriots' side during the Revolution.⁶ The Federal Constitution was to him a "majestic fabric"⁷, that enabled the establishment of the Federal Government, "which gave life and energy to the whole", and which, as demonstrated by the manner in which Shay's Rebellion was put down in 1787, "exceeded the most sanguine expectation" in its ability to bind all States to each other for the good of the Country.⁸ He deplored the atheistic tendencies exhibited in this

1 Justin Winson. op.cit. Vol. IV p. 121

2 Simeon Howard. Sermon before the House of Rep. and the Council. May 31, 1780. p.34

3 Samuel A. Eliot. op.cit. p. 95

4 Wm. Sprague. op.cit. p. 69

5 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p. 112

6 Justin Winson. op. cit. Vol.III. p. 125

7 John Lathrop. Sermon, July 4, 1796. p. 15

8 John Lathrop. Sermon at the Beginning of the 19th Century. p.14-15.

country¹ and the actions of that "terrible nation" (France)².

During the War of 1812, Lathrop preached sermon after sermon devoted almost entirely to that war and its foolishness³ but it was in the year 1812 that he came out so strongly for the Federalist party as to justify a long quotation from his sermon of August 20, 1812, when he said,

"The Federal government for many years was our strength and our glory, and our citizens desired no name more honorable than the name, federalist. But, alas, this honored name is now the scoff of the foolish But if federalism is proscribed, that federalism that gave strength and dignity to our country, what is the form of government...which present revilers of the federalists mean to establish?....Do any of them wish to prostrate all government, that they may make themselves rich with the spoils of the wealthy, whom they hate? and make themselves powerful with the authority which they take from better men? When I hear men reviling federalists, I am obliged to view them as enemies to the federal government, and as that is the government, which all good citizens of the United States have sworn to support, then who hate federalism, hate our own government, and are dangerous men." ⁴

That, along with his previous statements, leaves no doubt as to the political sentiments of this patriotic, energetic, outspoken minister in aristocratic Boston.

Doctor Jeremy Belknap, of Dover, New Hampshire, and the Federal Street Church in Boston, was "a strenuous assertor of the rights of the Colonies...a warm friend of the Revolution...and an advocate of the Constitution for the States in Union, which he considered the bulwark of our national security and welfare".⁵ From this we gain that he was a Whig, and probably a Federalist,

1 John Lathrop. op.cit. p.33

2 John Lathrop. National Fast Day Sermon, April 25, 1799 p. 22

3 John Lathrop. July 23, 1812; Title: "The Present War Unexpected, Unnecessary, and Ruinous".

John Lathrop. Feb.6, 1814; Title: "On the Law of Retaliation"

4 " " Sermon. Aug. 20, 1812. p. 29

5 John T. Kirkland. Sermon on Rev. Jeremy Belknap. June 23, 1798. p. 15.

The latter view being strengthened by his own words that "if there be any persons among us who are for re-uniting us with Great Britain, I hold their political principles in as much abhorrence as those who are subjecting us to the influence of France!"¹ The Federalists were for neutrality, the Republicans favored France, but who they were who wanted us to reunite with Great Britain is a mystery to me.

Of Ezra Ripley of Concord, we learn that he was warmly in favor of the American Revolution², hence a Whig, and that he was probably a Federalist later for he deplored the deistical tendencies in America³, which, we have learned, was what the Federalists constantly accused the Republicans of encouraging.

Dr. John Prince, of Salem, found it painful to speak of the errors or misconduct of "that nation (France) which began so well the work of political reformation and which set out with such philanthropic principles to benefit mankind".⁴ He also deplored all foreign influence in our government, while urging the support and love of the Constitution.⁵ Governor Increase Sumner, a Federalist, was declared by Prince to be a "most excellent chief magistrate of the Commonwealth", thus strengthening the belief that he, Prince, was a Federalist in his political tenets.⁶ At one time in praising the existing form of govern-

1 Jeremy Belknap. Sermon, May 9, 1798. National Fast Day

2 Barzillai Frost. Sermon on Ezra Ripley. Sept. 23, 1841.

3 Ezra Ripley. Sermon. Nov. 16, 1828

4 John Prince. Sermon. National Fast Day Sermon. May 9, 1798. p. 23, 24, 27.

5 John Prince. Sermon, Dec. 29, 1797. p. 24.

6 *ibid* p. 15.

ment he asks, "Or could one more democratic have any energy at all?"¹ Certainly he seemed to favor the government as run by the more aristocratic element, which, in some cases, as we have noted, even favored the retention of the monarchical form of rule.

Aaron Bancroft, of Worcester, was a "Federalist of the old school from which he never deviated a hand's breadth; and had he lived a hundred years, he would have been a Federalist to the last."² That he was a Federalist seems substantiated by his opposition to a system of philosophy appearing on the political horizon, the "apostles of which endeavor to introduce a national administration in politicks and morality, upon abstract principles"; obviously this was spoken against Deism and the Republican party.³ While he addresses himself to no party as he disavows the spirit, he admits that his political opinions may be discovered by the tenor of his observations, so we must conclude he was a Federalist since at great length he praises John Adams, while saying little or nothing about the President in office, Jefferson, an omission that speaks volumes.⁴

Thomas Thacher, of Dedham, was in favor of a fairly strong militia at a time when the Republicans were opposed to it⁵ and some years later, joined with most of the Federalists in urging Peace as a duty to our country and a responsibility to future ages.⁶ In connection with Thacher an interesting story is told: Dedham was at the time (1798) strongly Anti-Federalist (probably

1 John Prince. May 9, 1798. Sermon. p.15

2 Wm. Sprague. opcit. p. 139

3 Aaron Bancroft. General Election Sermon, May 27, 1801. p.14

4 ibid p. 21

5 Thomas Thacher. Public Thanksgiving Sermon, Feb. 19, 1795. p.16

6 Thomas Thacher. General Election Sermon. May 29, 1811.

Republican is meant) by a majority of three to one. The Third Parish, Thacher's church, was a hotbed of politics, and he often introduced partisan topics into his sermon. One of his sermons caused certain parishoners to leave the church, whereupon he said, "I see I have at least one apostolic gift - the power to cast out devils".¹ Thacher's parish, it seemed, grew worse in Jacobinism, due to the efforts of a traveling Anti-Federalist agitator, David Brown, who set up a liberty pole which was cut down by the Federalists in that parish.² This presents the problem of whether or not the minister's political beliefs were the same as those of a majority of his parish. In this case they were not, a fact which does not help to support the conclusion stated earlier.

Of John Read, who preached in Bridgewater, we learn simply that he was a "Federalist of the Washington and John Adams school, and enjoyed the friendship and confidence of those illustrious men".³ Eliphalet Porter of West Bridgewater was also a Federalist, it seems, so highly does he praise the neutrality principles of John Adams⁴, a man whom he calls a worthy successor of Washington, a man whose "abilities, integrity and patriotism have been tried and approved".⁵

Samuel Kendal, of Weston, we find praising the Constitution as the "great pillar which supports and exhibits our national strength and glory, the point of union in which all the others center,....the greatest civil blessing, diffusing happi-

1 Charles Warren. op.cit. p. 104-5.

2 *ibid* p. 107

3 Wm. Sprague. *Op.cit.* p. 143

4 Eliphalet Porter. National Fast Day Sermon, May 9, 1798. p.28

5 " " Sermon on Geo. Washington, Jan. 14, 1800. p.21

ness among all classes of citizens", which has exceeded the hopes of the most hopeful.¹ Later he questions the wisdom of a too hasty admission of foreigners, which the Republicans encouraged.² Also, so it seems, he objected to the Louisiana Purchase which Jefferson managed by adopting the principle of loose construction of the Constitution. Kendal says, "The Roman commonwealth was at length crushed by her own weight. Extending her territorial possessions, she lost her freedom". He fears that extending "the space over which a free republic operates may effect a radical change in the government, more or less harmful to liberty, may introduce monarchy...or lead to the division of a large into a number of small rival states".³ From all this it appears that Kendal was a Federalist.

Noah Worcester, who in his ministry lived in both New Hampshire and Massachusetts, was, along with his father and brothers, a Federalist, though looking with kindness on the other party.⁴ He was a great believer in peace, particularly as the War of 1812 threatened and was being waged. For a text once, he chose Hosea VIII 7: "For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind"⁵, while later when President Madison appointed a National Fast Day to pray for the success of our armies, Worcester said he could not do it, and so preached on the avoidance of hostilities between countries.⁶

Doctor Henry Ware, of Hingham, and later of the Harvard

1 Samuel Kendal. National Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb., 19, 1795. p. 19.

2 Samuel Kendal. General Election Sermon. May 30, 1804. p. 29

3 " " ibid p. 18

4 Wm. Ware. American Unitarian Biography. Vol. I p. 81

5 Noah Worcester. Sermon at the Declaration of War. June 28, 1812

6 Wm. Ware op.cit. Vol. I p. 74.

Divinity School, called the constitutions of government the bases of public happiness, which "unite and by their union establish liberty with order";¹ he deplored the French tendency towards atheism² and the "clamours made daily against the government by persons, who would make the people believe it too aristocratic in its form, and oppressive in its operation".³ Neutrality in European affairs⁴ was favored by him, who seems to have been a Federalist, judging by the above statements, and the fact that he disliked the presence of societies like the Jacobin Clubs in France, societies which, he says, were meant to oppose the general administration of the government.⁵ In this same sermon we find the word "aristocracy" used to describe the Democrats, thus reversing matters as Ware writes, "Equally unfriendly to the continuance of liberty and equal rights are the popular checks on our government. Whatever may be their pretences to democratic principles, they constitute a dangerous aristocracy".⁶

Dr. Thaddeus M. Harris, of Dorchester, claimed he had no interest to serve and no party to advocate but that of "my country and of my religion"⁷, yet in the same sermon, he advises prudent measures for security and self-defence, and hopes for pacific measures in the negotiations in Europe⁸; while eight

-
- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|
| 1 | Henry Ware. | Thanksgiving Sermon. | Feb. 19, 1795. | p. 7 |
| 2 | " | " | ibid | p. 22 |
| 3 | " | " | ibid | p. 26 |
| 4 | " | " | ibid | p. 18-19 |
| 5 | " | " | ibid | p. 15 |
| 6 | " | " | ibid | p. 27 |
| 7 | Thaddeus M. Harris. | National Fast Sermon. | May 9, 1798. | p. 9 |
| 8 | " | " | ibid | p. 23-24. |

years later he speaks of peace as a most desirable possession;¹ all of which were Federalist sentiments at the time he uttered them.

Peter Eaton, of Boxford, is found praising our navy, which saved commerce and which was originally opposed "by those who have uniformly opposed every measure calculated to secure the honor and attach importance to the United States".² At the same time Eaton justifies our neutrality by saying that in the American Revolution, France wasn't interested in our liberty but only in reaping advantages that would accompany the defeat of its enemy, England; hence no debt was due France, full compensation having been made.³ Are these not indications of a leaning towards Federalism?

William Emerson, of Boston, the father of Ralph Waldo Emerson, during the Revolutionary War, aroused the men of Concord and urged them to join the Minute Men⁴, thus displaying Whiggish tendencies. Twenty-seven years later there are indications of Federalism when he writes, "The man, who would rashly change even a government confessedly corrupt, betrays pitiable ignorance and presumption".⁵ This shows a conservatism exhibited by Federalists in all matters except theology. His Federalist bent is also indicated by his conception of the Constitution as "most excellent"⁵, and by an omission; when he

1 Thaddeus M. Harris. Sermon. Nov.2,1806. p.3

2 Peter Eaton. Thanksgiving Sermon. Nov.28,1799. p.15

3 ibid p.22

4 Alice M. Baldwin. op.cit. p. 164

5 William Emerson. Sermon. July 5, 1802. p.16

praises Washington, his "great successor" (Adams), and the Governor of Massachusetts (Strong, a Federalist), but makes no mention of the present President, Thomas Jefferson.¹

Nathaniel Thayer, of Lancaster, also displays Federalist inclinations as he speaks of "the unexampled patience and perseverance, magnanimity and well regulated independence of an Adams"; of "the moderation, forbearance, justice, and unvaried flexibility of the Supreme Executive (J. Adams) of our Nation", and of "the precipitancy, inconstancy, violence and outrage, which have prevailingly dictated the measures of the Directory of France".² Fourteen years later he speaks of the "present awful calamity, a war impolitick, unjust, and ruinous".³

John Kirkland, of the New South Church, Boston, and later President of Harvard University, though hesitant to declare his political affiliations, gave himself away, so to speak, by his words and actions. At the tender age of sixteen, while only a Junior at Harvard, he enlisted under General Lincoln in 1787 to put down Shay's Rebellion. "It was no juvenile or college freak, but the expression of that true and ardent patriotism, that earnest and devoted attachment to our republican institutions, which characterized him through life".⁴ Do not let the word "republican" be misleading, for the Federalists believed their political principles to be consistent with Democracy and Republican institutions, while, as we noted a

¹ William Emercon. Sermon. July 5, 1802. p.22

² Nathaniel Thayer. Artillery Sermon. June 4, 1798. p.14

³ " " Sermon. National Day of Public Prayer. Aug. 20, 1812. p.4,5.

⁴ William Ware. op.cit. p.280.

short time back, they accused the Jacobin Societies, supposedly sponsored by the Republican-Democrats, of being aristocratic. Shay's Rebellion was a democratic affair, marking the height of the democratic tide in western Massachusetts.¹ We have further evidence of Kirkland's Federalism in his expression of the desire for continued neutrality, though he feared that non-resistance in the England-France conflict could not exist much longer.² Most convincing, however, aside from his distress at the manner in which a well-intended revolution in France has turned out,³ are the words of a Federalist organ speaking of the Thanksgiving Sermon of November 28, 1798: "We wish it were in our power to do justice to the performances of a Tappen, an Eckley, a Lathrop, a Thacher, a Kirkland, a Baldwin, and a Kendal. Public opinion has passed their eulogy".⁴

Hezekiah Packard, who for nine years was at Chelmsford before going to Maine, gives only hints of his political beliefs. From these hints we are led to the conclusion that he was probably a Federalist. He deplores the tendency to call John Adams and Washington leaders of a British faction after nearly wearing themselves out in the service of this country.⁵ He warns, "if you be convinced that great evils attend the administration of our national government, you will be careful in attempting to remove them, not to introduce those which are greater"⁶. Packard admits that the French, in view of their

1 Anson E. Morse. op.cit. p.38

2 John T. Kirkland. National Fast Sermon. May 9, 1798. p.9-18

3 ibid p.8

4 W. DeLoss Love, Jr. op.cit. p. 375

5 Hezekiah Packard. State & National Fast Day Sermon. April 1799, p.28

6 ibid p. 19

help in the American Revolution, are being mistreated by our neutrality, but he goes on to show that it was "her prevailing wish to reduce and subdue her powerful and longdreaded enemy (Great Britain)"¹.

Among the Unitarian-Congregational ministers we find another who was apparently a Federalist, Abiel Abbot, of Haverhill and Beverly, as he speaks of our Constitution as a perfect instrument, for the administration of which "we are enviably happy";² and as he mentions the "illustrious Adams (John Adams), that peerless man in the chair of the Union who fills the chair (of President) with a dignity and wisdom."³

It might almost seem that, in view of the undemocratic spirit of the Federalists, we would find that great exponent of the supreme dignity of man, William Ellery Channing, politically affiliated with the more democratic Republicans. That, however, seems not to have been the case, as will be shown now. We might expect that he followed his father politically, his father having entertained George Washington at their home in Newport⁴, an act, though, that does not establish beyond doubt the father's politics, for men of both parties honored and would be honored to entertain Washington. William Ellery Channing arrived at his Federalist opinions, it seems, after deliberate

1 *ibid* p. 12

2 Abiel Abbot. Thanksgiving Sermon. Nov. 29, 1798. p.14

3 Abiel Abbot. Sermon. Eulogy of Washington. Feb.22, 1800. p. 26.

4 Charles H. Lyttle. The Liberal Gospel. Introduction. B.XIV

thought, whatever his father's attitude may have been. Channing lived for a time in Virginia, the native state of Jefferson, a state captivated with the brilliant hope of political progress which the French Revolution awakened. His native home was in New England, where the Federalist party was strongest and the French influence in America was dreaded, while Great Britain was revered. Channing thus had the opportunity to become conversant with both parties. From Virginia he wrote in 1798 or 1799,

"Should the worst happen, should my native country be prostrated by the arts and influence of demagogues at the feet of France, I will curse and quit it. I never will breathe the same air with those who are tainted with the foul impurities of French principles. I never will dwell in the country where I was born free, when it was doomed to groan under a foreign yoke. I...will take up my abode in the foreign land from which I boast my descent, and which my honest ancestors left in hopes of finding climes more favorable to liberty and to the rights of man."¹

He became a Federalist, thus joining the ranks of nearly all the eminent men of New England.² Though he usually refrained from entering politics, we find evidence of the Federalist stand in his violent opposition to the War of 1812, a war waged completely "without end, without means, and with less prospect of a happy termination"³, a war incapable of justification, though he then believed war under certain conditions to be necessary.⁴ In that same sermon he says,

"Our elective form of government makes it our duty to expose bad rulers, to strip them of unmerited confidence, and of abused power. - This is never more clearly our duty than when our rulers have plunged us into an unjustifiable and ruinous war-a war which is leading down to poverty, vice,

1 William Ware. op.cit. p.142-144

2 ibid. p. 154

3 W. E. Channing. Public Fast Sermon. July 23, 1812. p. 14

4 ibid. p. 6

"-and slavery. To reduce such men to a private station, no fair and upright means should be spared."

Two years earlier, April 9, 1812, he had refused to read a proclamation of Governor Gerry, Republican, a proclamation aimed to arouse political trouble, because he believed there was no reason, civil or religious, obliging him to produce the warrant for his (Gerry's) appointment from the pulpit.¹ The election was won by Caleb Strong, a Federalist, whom later Channing praised as a man who would "adorn any country and age" - while on the same occasion he makes no mention of President Madison, a Republican.²

In July 1814, Channing was included when Dr. Nathaniel Ames, a Republican, commented on "The Boston Rebels" joining with the enemy in celebrating "British Successes". Channing had preached at King's Chapel a sermon that culminated the celebration staged by the Federalists for the recent victories of the allied forces of England, Austria, Prussia, and Russia over Napoleon in Europe, a celebration that coincided with the British blockade of Boston.³ This incident only serves to strengthen the conviction that Channing was a Federalist, at least during the years from 1798 to 1814. Channing's Federalism was very deeply ingrained and his "social setting tended to increase its violence but the grave justness of his mind preserved him from the extravagance of thought and speech that was the general note".⁴ Chadwick

1 W. DeLoss Love Jr. op.cit. p389-390

2 W. E. Channing. Sermon. Sept. 18, 1814

3 Charles Warren. op.cit. p.27

4 John White Chadwick. William Ellery Channing. p.86.

says further of him,

"The aristocratic temper of the Boston Federalists harmonized well enough with Channing's natural inclination, but little with his moral confidence in human nature; and the latter was bound to grow upon the former steadily. Always in Channing, and ever more pronouncedly, we have the aristocratic inclination, and the intellectual and moral criticism upon it and suppression of it. With a constitutional and educated 'aloofness', equal to Emerson's, he did his best to force himself into the popular contacts that were proper to his deliberate estimate of social values and ideals."¹

In an address delivered in 1817, which must have angered his Federalist friends, Channing showed this tendency when he said,

"Should the history of the world be traced, I believe it would be found that society has derived a considerable portion of its best materials - I mean superior minds - from the inferior classes of society ---The higher classes have a tendency to intellectual imbecility, and need to be replenished from the lower. The looser relations of the poor are more favorable to native vigor, originality, freshness of thought, where real genius is possessed; and, from all this, it follows that the intellectual progress of a community, its mental activity, its energy of thought and action, will be promoted by extending to all classes the means of education, by giving everywhere to superior minds the opportunity of emerging and of lending their impulse to society."²

So it seems that Channing was a Federalist early in the years of his career, but as he matured he recognized in the aristocratic inclinations of the Federalists that with which he was not whole heartedly in accord.

Of Joseph Stevens Buckminster, of the Brattle Street Church, we find this simple entry in the diary of William Bentley, an entry that tells us sufficiently what Buckminster's political inclinations were: "Went to Brattle Street Church

1 John White Chadwick. William Ellery Channing. p. 189
2 ibid p. 190

and heard Mr. Buckminster, the Incumbant. Was sorry to find devotion prostituted to sly insinuations against the present administration".¹ Jefferson was then President.

James Flint, of East Bridgewater and later Salem, when he filled the vacancy created by Bentley's death, was also a Federalist, it seems. In a sermon delivered in 1815, he denounces the attack made on Canada as "impolitic, cruel and wicked", being regarded by the people in New England especially as an "unprovoked and murderous assault upon peaceable and unoffending neighbors".² He hoped all states would legislate so as to prevent the repetition of an "offensive war".³ Pointing out that the war achieved nothing promised, "obtained no security against the violation of trade and sailors' rights, while they (its formenters) have been enjoying the emoluments and honors of office" and while the people suffered embarrassment, distress, loss of property and increased taxes; Flint recommended that the people "in the future trust with office those men only, whose known principles, and tried virtues, entitle them to the public confidence".⁴

Samuel Casey, for seven years, 1808-1815, associated with James Freeman as Junior Pastor of King's Chapel, Boston, deplores, like Flint, the presence in the national government of men who corrupt, not promote, public virtue, who cause a decline in the spirit of patriotism, while, at the same time he adds, "In this part (Massachusetts) of the country at least, the wise and good are in authority (Caleb Strong, a Federalist, was then Governor

1 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Vol.3. p.193. Entry on Sept.26, 1805.

2 James Flint. Anniversary Election Sermon. May 31, 1815. p.17

3 *ibid* p. 25

4 *ibid* p. 18-19.

of the State)" Again we find among the liberal clergy Federalist inclinations.

The ministers, mentioned thus far in this section, include only about one-half of those listed by William Sprague as Unitarian-Congregational Ministers. Those not mentioned here, are not because no evidence of their political affiliations was found. There was, however, one minister who should have been listed, but was not. Peter Thacher settled in Boston, January 12, 1785, "and with him orthodoxy departed forever from Brattle Street Church".¹ Previously he had filled a pulpit in Malden. He was for the state support of Clergy, but James Sullivan, a Republican and Unitarian, opposed it. This controversy did not disturb the friendly relations of the pastor and parishoner; on the contrary, they were always particularly friendly and confidential, while their mutual regard for Hancock strengthened those ties.² It will be recalled that the Federalists did not want to sever the connection of church and state; and that the Unitarians were the last to agree to the ultimate severance of that connection. So it seems that Thacher may be considered a Federalist and a Unitarian.

While there may have been many Unitarian ministers who were also Republicans, there certainly must be considerable significance attached to the fact that the presence of only one was discovered, who, as has been so frequently mentioned, was William Bentley of Salem, where he preached for thirty-seven years, ending in 1819, years that were politically and

1 James S. Loring. The Hundred Boston Orators, 1770-1852. p.126

2 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p.339

religiously full of controversy. A liberal Congregationalist¹, he had refused to take part in the annual service at the Female Asylum because "the sect have excluded Unitarian preachers"². An ardent Republican of the Jefferson and Madison School³, with his politics as liberal as his religion, he greatly influenced the upper classes of Salem who were quite democratic, for many sea-captains and merchants were among his parishoners.⁴ The Election sermon of 1807 showed him to be one of the few Congregational ministers who had accepted the Republican principles at that time⁵, yet for all the fact that he was a Republican, a warm admirer of President Jefferson, which incurred the dislike of the conservatives⁶, Bentley was extremely fair in his recognition of men of worth, whatever their political party. In 1796, he says, "a Republican ought to pay a just tribute of respect to that patriot (J. Adams), who justly holds a distinguished office in our federal government⁷", a man whose portrait he wants included among those of our "Eminent men" for "I feel that too much cannot be done to encourage the patriotism of John Adams or to express the public gratitude"⁸. Washington, as a national benefactor, should be remembered because he "employed arms with glory", and Jefferson, "because he has in-

1 W.A. Robinson. op.cit. p.137

2 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Entry for July 25, 1819. Vol.4 p.607

3 Samuel A. Eliot. op.cit. Vol.I p.155

& Wm. Sprague. op.cit. p. 156. 1807. p.22

4 Hervey P. Prentiss. Timothy Pickering and the Federalist Party, 1801-1804. p.6

5 Jacob Meyer. op.cit. p. 149

6 G. Adolf Koch. op.cit. p. 217

7 Wm. Bentley. Artillery Sermon. June 6, 1796. p. 19

8 Wm. Bentley. Diary Entry for Oct. 10, 1809. Vol.3. p. 467

structed us in the arts of peace".¹ We cannot help liking Bentley all the more for his sense of fairness, even though the ministers in the vicinity of Salem bitterly opposed his Unitarian views, he being a pioneer in introducing those views into this country², and even though his Alma Mater, Harvard, had withheld her honors and civilities from him until almost his last days; he received the degree of D.D. only five months before he died, a degree awarded in "doing justice to his vast learning, his noble benevolence and his eminent merits."³

Thus Bentley, it seems, stood nearly alone among the ministers of his own denomination in believing without apparent equivocation in the tenets of the Republican party. That he stood entirely alone is to be doubted; as to the ministers, if any, who stood with him, nothing was learned; as to the Unitarian laymen, of whom there were several, we shall soon learn.

-
- 1 W. Bentley. General Election Sermon. May 27, 1807. p.22
 - 2 W. Bentley. Diary. Introduction. Vol.I. p. XIV
 - 3 W. Bentley. Diary. Vol. 4. p. 637. From Notebook kept by B. F. Browne.

CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL TENETS OF PROMINENT UNITARIAN-CONGREGATIONAL LAYMEN 1775-1825.

That prominent laymen were influential is hardly to be doubted, but their following was probably political, while there might be a great difference in their religious views. Thus when a prominent Unitarian layman was a Republican, it does not mean that his political followers were Unitarians. To be sure the laymen are probably symptomatic. Hence, here, where a conclusion is being built upon the supposition, however weak, that by finding out the religious and political beliefs of eminent men, we may determine the general relation of a certain denomination to a certain political party, the importance of ministers is greater than that of eminent laymen, for ministers are apt - though it doesn't necessarily have to be true - to be able to influence both religiously and politically, those under them. A few isolated cases, however, may serve here to show the general trends of the period, while at the same time possibly weakening a conclusion necessarily based on such questionable assumptions.

There are two outstanding cases in which father and son were in accord religiously, but differed politically; they are John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams; and James Sullivan and his son William. In the former case, the father adhered to the Federalist theory of and practices in government, while among the Sullivans, the son was the Federalist.

John Adams was the "bold champion of the American

Revolution, and later equally fearless in his advocacy of strong government and of aristocratic principles"¹, and, as has been mentioned, an admirer of the British form of government to such a degree as to want most of it incorporated in the United States' form of government. While he and his "Aristocratical Cohorts" were in power, the government's expenses rose beyond the country's means, laws were passed for raising the standing army, and the Alien and Sedition laws were passed.² His popularity was not great as he himself explains:

"I had at first no support but from the Essex Junto (composed of Federalists)---they supported me timorously and at last would not go with me to so high a mark as I aimed at, which was a complete negative in the governor upon all laws. They made me however draw up the constitution, and it was finally adopted, with some amendments very much for the worse ----A foundation was laid for much jealousy and unpopularity, against me, among the democratical people of the state."³

His son, John Quincy Adams, one of the founders of the Unitarian Church in Washington⁴, was originally a Federalist, but was alienated from that party by the way it handled the Leopard-Chesapeake affair, - the English man of war, the Leopard, humiliated the American Chesapeake in 1806. The Federalist, John Lowell, justified the attack by the Leopard, whereupon Adams "burst his bonds" and separated from that party and in 1808, he became openly allied with the Republicans.⁵

Earlier, in 1803, he was sent to the Federal Senate,

1 Charles E. Merriam. op.cit. p.123

2 Thomas B. VanTuyt. Address: The Origin and Progress of Federalism. Nov. 14, 1841. p.12

3 Anson E. Morse. op. cit. p. 18-19.

4 John C. Learned. Discourse: Unitarianism, Its History and Principle. p. 15.

5 A. B. Hart. op.cit. Vol.III P. 434.

where he regularly supported the measures of Jefferson, and "Because of that act of obedience to the dictates of his conscience and judgment, the legislature of Massachusetts censured him, so he resigned his seat in 1806".¹ From then on his Republicanism constantly increased.

James Sullivan, Governor of Massachusetts, 1807-08, was an active churchman, having been on the committee to chose Peter Thacher as successor of Dr. Samuel Cooper in the pulpit of Brattle Street Church.² He was joined with others in applications to the General Court in behalf of the Massachusetts Congregation Society, and other charitable institutions for grants of land in the eastern county.³ Annually he made visits to every county in the state, so became well acquainted with the whole body of Congregational clergy, and since he was republican, his political opinions often differed from theirs, which more generally coincided with the federal creed, being conservative.⁴ Thacher, it has been previously observed, was a liberal Congregationalist, hence, since Sullivan helped secure him for the Brattle Street Church, we may conclude that he was in accord with Thacher's religious views, and so was a Unitarian.

His son, William - though there is no mention of the Church he attended - may possibly have been a Unitarian, attending services with his father. In fact it is quite likely he did. In 1803, having joined the Federalists he was appointed to

1 Benson J. Lessing. Lines of 350 Celebrated Americans p. 312

2 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p. 340

3 J. ibid p. 293

4 J. ibid p. 359

deliver the Boston oration on the Fourth of July,¹ in which he praised Washington's and Adams' administrations, while lauding Federalism in general.² He went on to say, "it is not from monarchy - it is not from aristocracy - that dangers threaten; but do they not threaten from Democracy?"³

George Cabot, of the Essex Junto, was a Unitarian⁴ having been a member of the Church, New South, under the care of Kirkland and Samuel Thacher, both Unitarians⁵, and a Federalist, having been "Counsellor of most of the intelligent Statesmen on the Federal side in the State" and national Government.⁶

Stephen Higginson was a "thorough-going, uncompromising, ardent, steadfast Federalist"⁷, who was a Liberal, judging from a letter he wrote to John Pierce, the liberal minister of the Brookline Congregational Church; in which he sent one hundred dollars to help in illness, because he didn't believe ministers sufficiently compensated.⁸

John Lowell, a lawyer, in true Federalist fashion, denounced the Louisiana Purchase, saying, "It would be superfluous to prove the government, against the ~~w~~pirit of the Constitution, and the interests of a republick, bought Louisiana".⁹ Two pamphlets were written by him and called "Mr. Madison's War" and "Perpetual War the Policy of Mr. Madison". Always he wrote

¹Thomas Amory. opcit. p. 399

² Wm. Sullivan. Oration. July 4, 1803. p.20-21

³ J. S. Loring. The Hundred Boston Orators, 1770-1852. p.213-14

⁴ R.T.Lee. The Social Philosophy of Mass. Federalists. p.24

⁵ J. T. Kirkland. Sermon on Cabot. Orbituary. p. 26

⁶ J. T. Kirkland. Sermon on Cabot. " p. 25

⁷ Thos. W. Higginson. Life and Times of Stephen Higginson. p.279

⁸ ibid p. 251

⁹ John Lowell. Comparison of Washington's and Jefferson's Administrations. p. 5

on the Federal side, which was the side of peace and of opposition to the measures of the general government.¹ Lowell, during the Unitarian Controversy, would have kept quiet "had he not been convinced that it was of greatest importance --that some layman of character and influence should ---cause it to be publically known and felt, that the Unitarian ministers did not stand alone in their desertion of the so-called orthodox systems".²

Christopher Gore, Governor of Massachusetts, 1809-10, was a noted Federalist lawyer³, and along with Judge George Minot was a Unitarian, both having united themselves with King's Chapel when that church was the only avowed Unitarian church in the country.⁴

Minot, while he wished well to both parties never disguised or concealed his sentiments, and was known to belong to the party of which Bowdoin was the head, which placed Increase Sumner in the Governor's Chair in 1797, and which supported Washington's administration.⁵

Harrison Gray Otis was a Federalist who in 1798 represented Boston district in the Federal Congress, and remained there until the Republicans under Jefferson came into power. In 1823, when Federalism was rapidly waning, he was nominated by that party for Governor of Massachusetts, but in the election was defeated.⁶ Like so many other Federalists he was a Unitarian.⁷

1 F.W.P.Greenwood. Sermon on John Lowell. March 27, 1840 p.14

2 ibid p. 17

3 Charles Warren. op.cit. p. 199

4 F.W.P.Greenwood. Sermon on Christopher Gore. March 11, 1827

5 B. J. Lessing op.cit. p. 402

6 James Freeman. Sermon on Judge Geo. R. Minot. Jan.2, 1802. p.216

7 C.W.Wendte. What Do the Unitarians Believe?

The father of Theodore Parker, John Parker, was in theology a Unitarian before Unitarianism was preached as a system in New England, and in politics a Federalist, when there were but four besides him in all of Lexington.¹

Theophilus Parsons, one of the ^{Junto}Essex, became a Unitarian. He was instrumental in placing Kirkland as the first Unitarian President of Harvard College, and Kirkland was followed by Josiah Quincy, who thus continued the Unitarian regime.² Quincy associated with the Federalist party when he started to practice law in 1790, the time of the formation of the Federal and Republican parties.³

Timothy Pickering, a Federalist and Unitarian, wrote Jefferson in 1821 recommending Channing's sermons to him.² Samuel Dexter, a Unitarian belonging to the same church as James Sullivan⁴, was a Federalist⁵, though he was a friend of Jefferson and was his Secretary of the Treasury for four and a half months in 1801 and though he was called one of the most aristocratic of the democrats.⁶

Governor Bowdoin, a Federalist Governor of Massachusetts, was declared in 1788 to be openly the friend of Unitarianism⁷.

So, we might continue picking out isolated cases of

-
- 1 Peter Dean. Life and Teaching of Theodore Parker. p.2
 - 2 R. T. Lee. op.cit. p. 24
 - 3 B. J. Lessing. op.cit. p. 424.
 - 4 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p. 340
 - 5 Charles Warren. op.cit. p. 199
 - 6 Henry Adams. op.cit. p. 193
 - 7 Thomas Belsham. American Unitarianism. p. 16. Note

Federalists who were Unitarian laymen, and of Unitarians who were Federalists, but the value of such findings is little, for, as has been previously stated, such laymen did not necessarily change or affect the religious opinions of their admirers as the minister probably influenced the political sentiments of his parishoners. To do justice, however, it is only right that we should mention several very prominent Republicans who were Unitarian. Again the effort is only a mere tapping the list of many that could probably be found. But before going on to this, it might be said that Fisher Ames, a leading Federalist in Massachusetts, by one person was said to be a Unitarian¹, whereas he was a liberal Episcopalian.

John Gardiner, a lawyer of great note -- was a zealous republican who earned the title of law reformer, and as one of the most influential of early Unitarians, he "aided in the preparation of the King's Chapel liturgy, by adapting the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church to meet the doctrinal views of that persuasion".²

Another prominent Unitarian and Republican was Joseph Story of whom considerable has already been said. His uncle was a Calvinist and was minister of the church to which his father belonged, but the latter was an Arminian in principle,³ principles which Joseph Story himself seemed to have followed. His Republicanism is well known, though his fairness to the Federalists is shown by his non-partisan statements,⁴ statements

1 C. W. Wendt. op. cit

2 Thomas Amory. op.cit. p. 270-271

3 Wm. W. Story. Life and letters of Joseph Story. p.7

4 ibid p. 128

made because he "acknowledged no political code of morals in violence of private duty and conscience"; he was no person,

"Who to party gave up what was meant for Mankind".¹

"Pseudo-republican", he has been called because he opposed the embargo act that was meant to destroy the commercial interests so as to make the country self-subsistent², an infidelity by which William Bentley thought Story had harmed the Republican cause in Salem.³

Another Unitarian-Republican was General Levi Lincoln Sr., in 1788 Lieutenant-Governor, later acting Governor after the death of Governor James Sullivan in 1808.⁴ Lincoln and the two or three other men who have been mentioned as being both Republicans and Unitarians, serve primarily as a demonstration of the fact that not all of the prominent men of the time were Federalists. Beyond that their value towards the substantiation of the conclusion stated at the beginning, is really almost negligible.

1 Wm. W. Story. op.cit. p. 127

2 ibid p. 172

3 Wm. Bentley. Diary. Entry for Mar. 12, 1808. Vol.II p.348

4 Thomas Belsham. op.cit. p.16. Note. and the Columbian Centinel for Jan. 14, 1801.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The statement has been made, it will be remembered, that the Unitarians were predominantly Federalists, that is that those who were liberal in their theological outlook, whether called Congregationalist or Unitarian, were conservative in their political views. It has been said here that to come to a solution mathematically exact is an impossibility unless time were taken to examine the records or biographies of every Unitarian living between the years 1775 and 1825 so as to determine each person's political beliefs (it is doubtful if such complete records exist). The only method left by which it was possible to prove or disprove the assertion made, was to determine the general character of the Federalists and of the Unitarian-Congregationalists; then to find, if possible, the possible relationship existing between those two institutions, and finally to determine the political inclinations of many of the liberal ministers of the period. It has been assumed that the parishoners in general followed their pastor in political as well as theological matters, an assumption, we have found to be not exactly accurate.

Following out this general method, we have discovered several facts. First, the Federalists were the cultured, wealthy, aristocratic group of the day. Second, the Liberals were the cultured, wealthy, aristocratic group of the day, at least in Massachusetts. Third, the Federalist Party and the Liberal Church, later only the Unitarian wing of it, have been frequently associated by reliable authorities in subsequent periods.

Fourth, with few exceptions, all the Congregational ministers mentioned by Mr. Sprague as being liberal, where evidence could be found, have appeared to be Federalist or aristocratic in political tenets. Fifth, in the process of securing this information, there were found more specific examples of Federalist-Unitarian than Republican-Unitarian laymen.

From all of this, it would seem that when it is said that all the Unitarians were Federalists, that statement comes very near being the truth. To be dogmatic in uttering that statement is impossible because it is based on assumption that defies exact proof, but to say, "in our opinion Liberalism (in religion) and Federalism were very closely related through the same persons being exponents of both" is to speak correctly in view of the facts collected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sermons, Orations, Pamphlets.

- Abbot, Abiel. Thanksgiving Sermon. Nov. 29, 1798. (Haverhill)
 Thanksgiving Sermon. Nov. 28, 1799.
 Washington. Feb. 22, 1800
- Aiken, Solomon. Address to Federal Clergymen (on the War of 1812)
 Feb. 25, 1813.
- Allen, Wilkes. Henry Cummings. Sept. 8, 1823.
- Allyn, John. Anniversary Sermon. May 29, 1805
- Bancroft, Aaron. General Election Sermon. May 27, 1801
- Barnard, Thomas. National Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb. 19, 1795.
- Barnes, David. Washington. Feb. 22, 1800
- Batchelor, George. The Unitarian Church in Chicago.
- Belknap, Jeremy. National Fast Sermon. May 9, 1798.
- Belsham, Thomas. American Unitarianism. 1815
- Bentley, William. Artillery Sermon. June 6, 1796.
 General Election Sermon. May 27, 1807.
- Brigham, Charles H. Rev. Simeon Doggett. 1852
- Buckminster, Joseph S. James Sullivan. 1809
- Cary, Samuel. National Fast Sermon. Sept. 9, 1813.
- Chadwick, John W. Unitarianism, a Democratic System of Religion
 1889.
- Channing, Wm. Ellery. Public Fast Sermon. July 23, 1812.
 Letter to S. C. Thacher. June 20, 1815
 Sermon. Sept. 18, 1814.
- Clarke, John. Sermon on Charles Channcey. Feb. 15, 1787.
- Cooke, Parsons. Fast Sermon. April 3, 1828.
 Reply to Christian Examiner. 1828.
- Crooker, J. H. Unitarians as Congregationalists. 1866.
- Crothers, Samuel H. The Unitarianism of Thomas Jefferson. 1919.

Cummings, Henry. Election Sermon. May 28, 1783.
Fast and Thanksgiving Sermon. Dec. 15, 1796.

deNormandie, James. The National Work of the Unitarian Church
in America. 1880.

Eaton, Peter. Thanksgiving Sermon. Nov. 28, 1799.

Emerson, William. Sermon. July 5, 1802.

Everett, S. Abiel Abbot. 1831.

Flint, James. Anniversary Election Sermon. May 31, 1815

Freeman, James. Judge G. R. Minot. Jan. 2, 1802.

Frost, Barzilla. Ezra Ripley. Sept. 23, 1841.

Greenwood, F. W. P. Christopher Gore. March 11, 1827.
John Lowell. March 27, 1840.

Harris, Thaddeus Mason. National Fast Sermon. May 9, 1798.
Sermon. Nov. 2, 1806.

Howard, Simeon. Sermon before House and Council. May 31, 1780.

Kendal, Samuel. National Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb. 19, 1795.
General Election Sermon. May 30, 1804.

Kirkland, John^d. National Fast Sermon. May 9, 1798.
Jeremy Belknap. June 27, 1798.
George Cabot. April, 1823.

Lathrop, John. Sermon. July 4, 1796.
National Fast Sermon. Apr. 25, 1799.
Sermon. About Jan. 1, 1800.
Sermon. Aug. 20, 1812.
Sermon. July 23, 1812.
Sermon. Feb. 6, 1814.
National Thanksgiving Sermon. Apr. 13, 1815.

Learned, John C. Unitarianism, Its History and Principles.
May 12, 1878.

Lothrop, S. K. Harrison Gray Otis. Nov. 5, 1845.

Lowell, John. Comparison of Washington's and Jefferson's Ad-
ministrations. 1810.

Osgood, David. National Fast Sermon. May 9, 1798.

Packard, Hezekiah. Fast Sermon. April 1799.

Palmer, Stephan. Thomas Thacher. Oct. 22, 1812.

"Philelentheros". A Blow at the Root of Aristocracy. 1810.

Porter, Eliphalet. Washington. Jan. 14, 1800
Fast Day Sermon. May 9, 1798.

Prince, John. Fast Day Sermon. May 9, 1798.
Sermon. Dec. 29, 1799.

Richardson, Joseph. Fast Day Sermon. Apr. 5, 1810.

Ripley, Ezra. Sermon. Nov. 16, 1828.

Sullivan, William. Oration. July 4, 1803.

Thacher, Thomas. Public Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb. 19, 1795.
General Election Sermon. May 29, 1811.

Thayer, Nathaniel. Artillery Sermon. June 4, 1798.
National Fast Sermon. Aug. 20, 1812.

Thompson, Otis. Mass. Annual Fast Sermon. Apr. 9, 1812.
National Fast Sermon. Aug. 20, 1812.

Van Tuyl, Thomas B. The Origin and Progress of Federalism.
Nov. 11, 1841.

Ware, Henry. Thanksgiving Sermon. Feb. 19, 1795.
Daniel Shute. Sept. 1, 1802.

Wendte, C. W. What do Americans Believe?

West, Samuel, (of Needham) Election Day Sermon. May 31, 1786

Worcester, Noah. Sermon. June 28, 1812.

Young, Alexander. Evangelical Unitarianism Adopted to the
Poor and Unlearned. 1830.

History and Political Works.

- Adams, Ephraim Douglas. The Power of Ideals in American History. 1923.
- Adams, Henry. History of U. S. of America during the First Administration of Thomas Jefferson. 1891.
- Allen, Joseph Henry. Unitarianism Since the Reformation. 1894
- Beard, Charles A. The American Party Battle. 1928.
- Bryce, James. The American Commonwealth. Vol. II. 1920.
- Cooke, George Willis. Unitarianism in America. 1902.
- Cooper (T.V.) and Fenton (H.T.). American Politics. 1892.
- Dunning, Albert E. Congregationalists in America. 1894.
- Eager, George H. Historical Sketch of the Second Church in Boston. 1894.
- Hart, A. B. Editor. Commonwealth History of Massachusetts, Vol. III. 1929.
- Hopkins, James H. History of the Political Parties in the United States. 1900.
- King's Chapel Lectures. The Religious History of New England. 1917.
- McLaughlin and Hart. Cyclopedia of American Government. Vol. I 1914.
- Merriam, Charles Edward. A History of American Political Theories. 1915.
- Morse, Ansen Ely. The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800. 1909.
- Robinson, William A. Jeffersonian Democracy in New England. 1916.
- Smith, Herbert A. Federalism in North America. 1922.
- Winson, Justin. Editor, The Memorial History of Boston. 1881
Editor, Narrative and Critical History of America. 1884-89.
- Woodburn, James A. Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States. 1903.

Biographies

- Amory, Thomas C. Life of James Sullivan. 1859.
- Chadwick, John White. William Ellery Channing. 1903.
- Dean, Peter. Life and Teaching of Theodore Parker. 1877.
- Eliot, John. A Biographical Dictionary. 1809.
- Eliot, Samuel A. Heralds of a Liberal Faith. Vol. I. 1910.
- Higginson, Thomas W. Life and Times of Stephan Higginson. 1907.
- Lessing, Benson J. Lines of 350 Celebrate Americans. 1869.
- Loring, James Spear. The Hundred Boston Orators 1770-1852. 1852.
- Prentiss, Hervev Patnam. Timothy Pickering and the Federalist Party. 1801-1804. 1933.
- Sabini, Lorenzo. Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution. Vols. II. 1864.
- Sprague, William B. Life of Jedidiah Morse. 1874.
Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit. 1865.
- Story, William W. Life and Letters of Joseph Story. 1851.
- Ware, William. American Unitarian Society. 1850.
- Warren, Charles. Jacobin and Junto. 1931.
- Weiss, John. Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. 1894.

Miscellaneous Works:

Baldwin, Alice M. The New England Clergy and the American Revolution. 1928.

Bentley, William. Diary. 1905.

Columbian Centinal. Aug. 2, 1800.

Continental Journal. Jan. 22, 1784.

Gazette (of J. Russell). Feb. 20, 1800.

Koch, G. Adolf. Republican Religion. 1933.

Lee, R. T. The Social Philosophy of the Massachusetts Federalists. 1929.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. Boston. In Historic Towns. Edited by E.A. Freeman and W. Hunt. 1902.

Love, W. DeLoss Jr. The Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England. 1895.

Lyttle, Charles H. The Liberal Gospel. 1925.

Meyer, Jacob C. Church and State in Massachusetts. 1930.

Parkman, Francis, and Others. Account of Unit. in Boston in 1812. 1829.

Weigle, Luther A. American Idealism. In The Pageant of America, vol X. 1928.